DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 081 CE 011 515

TITLE	Evaluation and Audit of Career and Vocational Teacher Education Centers. Final Report. 1972-1973 School Year.
INSTITUTION	Morin (Alfred J.) and Associates, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Georgia State Dept. of Education, Atlanta. Office of Instructional Services.
BUREAU NO	5307
PUB DATE	[74]
NOTE	302p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$16.73 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Career Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; State Programs; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Centers; Teacher Workshops; *Vocational Education; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Georgia

ABSTRACT

The Georgia State Department of Education engaged in the development of three Career and Vocational Teacher Education Centers (located at the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, and Georgia Southern College) during the 1972-73 school year. Their primary purpose was to provide an interdisciplinary approach to their teacher education programs by offering more relevant short-term inservice training for teachers and administrators who were beginning to incorporate career education into their respective classrooms and schools. The centers presented workshops during the summer of 1972, provided technical assistance to school districts through onsite visits during the school year, and coordinated the efforts of their own institutional departments in terms of career education. In this final evaluation report, sections 1 and 2 describe the procedures used by the evaluation team in collecting and analyzing data obtained from the questionnaires mailed to both summer workshop participants and to nonparticipants. Sections 3 through 6 deal with data presentation, data interpretation, and evaluation findings on a component by component basis for each center. The data presentation and data interpretation for the questionnaire administered to superintendents and principals is described in section 7 along with the information obtained from the onsite interviews and related evaluation findings. Section 8 presents the major recommendations of the evaluation team based upon the evaluation findings. (WL)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED140081

FINAL REPORT

1972-1973 SCHOOL YEAR

EVALUATION AND AUDIT OF CAREER AND VOCATIONAL TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

submitted to

STATE OF GEORGIA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES
ATLANTA 30334

Project No. 5307

CE 011 515

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
OVERVIEW	1
Section 1 - DATA COLLECTION	5
Section 2 - DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES	15
Section 3 - DATA PRESENTATION	21
Section 4 - GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE	143
Component A	
Component B	
Component C	
Component D	
Component E	
Component G	
Section 5 - GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	159
Component A	
Component B	
Component C	
Component D	
Component E	
Section 6 - UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	171
Component A & B	
Component C	
Component D	
Component E	
Component G	
Section 7 - ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEWS	183
Section 8 - SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	195

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF 1972 SUMMER WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS, NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED AND PERCENT OF RETURNS

TABLE 2: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT A: FUSING CONCEPTS OF SELF AND CAREER AWARENESS

TABLE 3: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT B: INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM DEVELOPMENT

TABLE 4: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT C: MANAGING CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

TABLE 5: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT D: JOB PLACEMENT

TABLE 6: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT E: PRE-VOCATIONAL (GSC & UG) AND DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED IN OFFICE OCCUPATIONS (GSU)

TABLE 7: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT F: WORLD OF CONSTRUCTION

TABLE 8: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT G: WORLD OF MANUFACTURING

TABLE 9: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT H: TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER

TABLE 10: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR ADMINISTRATORS

TABLE 11: SUMMARY OF DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF SEPARATE WORKSHOP COMPONENT OBJECTIVES FOR GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

TABLE 12: SUMMARY OF DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF SEPARATE WORKSHOP COMPONENT OBJECTIVES FOR GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

TABLE 13: SUMMARY OF DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF SEPARATE WORKSHOP COMPONENT OBJECTIVES FOR UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

OVERVIEW

The Georgia State Department of Education engaged in the development of three Career and Vocational Teacher Education Centers during the 1972-1973 school year. The Centers were established at the University of Georgia, Georgia State University and Georgia Southern College. Their primary purpose was to provide an interdisciplinary approach to their teacher education programs by offering more relevant short-term in-service training for teachers and administrators who were beginning to incorporate career education into their respective classrooms and schools. The Centers presented workshops during the summer of 1972, provided technical assistance to school districts through on-site visits during the school year, and coordinated the efforts of their own institutional departments in terms of career education efforts.

The State Department of Education, Office of Instructional Services, contracted with ALFRED J. MORIN AND ASSOCIATES (Evaluation Team) in January of 1973 to undertake an external, third party, evaluation and program audit of the training and follow-up services provided by the three Centers. The objectives of the State Department of Education provided for a) determination of the extent each Center accomplished its process and product objectives, b) determination of the extent each Center altered

the behavior of workshop participants, and c) determination of reasons why workshop participants did not alter their behavior if such a condition was identified by the Evaluation Team.

The activities undertaken to assess the evaluation objectives included the following:

- Review of each institution's program plan, workshop material, and related documents in order to identify process and project objectives.
- Completion of on-site visits at each institution's Center in order to verify the identified process and product objective.
- Development of separate questionnaire for each workshop component offered at each institution.
- Development of a questionnaire for teachers and administrators of school districts which participated in the summer workshop programs.
- Identification of a participant (target) sample to which the questionnaires were mailed.
- Identification of a non-participant (control) sample to which duplicate questionnaires were mailed for comparison purposes.
- Identification of superintendents and principals of school districts which participated in the summer workshops.
- Completion of on-site visits at the institutional Centers and State Department of Education to review and modify all questionnaires.
- Mailing of questionnaires to the identified sample groups.
- Tabulation of responses and computation of numbers and percentages of responses to individual items on all questionnaires.
- Computation of a Chi-Square statistical test on all questionnaire items which had both a participant and non-participant response.

- Completion of on-site interviews with superintendents (or their designated representative) of participating school districts to elaborate upon their questionnaire responses.
- Determination of the reliability of the questionnaires by the test-retest method utilizing a Pearson Product Moment Correlation.
- Completion of data analysis and interpretive narrative which described the evaluation findings for all components at the three Centers.

The interim report from the Evaluation Team presented information on the implementation of each of the three Career and Vocational Teacher Education Centers, the objectives identified for each workshop, the workshop enrollments, and the evaluation and program audit procedures already undertaken.

Sections 1 and 2 of this final report describe the procedures utilized by the Evaluation Team in the collection and analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaires mailed to both summer workshop participants and to non-participants. Sections 3 through 6 deal with data presentation, data interpretation, and evaluation findings on a component by component basis for each Center at the three institutions. The data presentation and data interpretation for the questionnaire administered to superintendents and principals is described in Section 7 along with the information obtained from the on-site interviews and related evaluation findings. Section 8 of this report presents the major recommendations of the

Evaluation Team based upon the evaluation findings reported in previous sections. A summary of major evaluation recommendations is provided in Section 8.

Section 1 - DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The initial step in the data collection process was a visit to each of the three Centers which conducted workshops in Career and Vocational Education for teachers during the summer of 1972. Purposes of these on-site visits included a) obtaining copies of program documents and b) obtaining information from staff members relative to the implementation of the program including summer workshop planning and implementation phases and subsequent follow-up activities.

This on-site procedure was necessitated by the fact that the RFP/Contract process for the evaluation and program audit of the Center programs was not undertaken until four to six months after the completion of the summer workshops upon which the Evaluation Team had to focus.

Participant Questionnaire Development

Identification of the objectives for each workshop component which was presented at each of the three Centers was then undertaken by the Evaluation Team. Program objectives for each component were identified in the proposals and interim reports developed by each Center and submitted to the State Department of Education. This was done to assist in identifying changes in initial objectives and to identify workshop components which

had been revised or deleted from each Center's program. All objectives were reviewed with each Center Director and his staff. Changes in component objectives, and workshops which were eventually dropped that were identified by the Evaluation Team were already a matter of record and had received prior approval from the State Department of Education. Most other modifications to Center programs were also made available to the Evaluation Team.

The Evaluation Team experienced considerable difficulty in its initial interpretation of many of the component objectives at each of the three Centers. They were not always written in behavioral or performance oriented terms which is a requirement for the development of assessment instruments. Time did not allow for any defective objectives to be rewritten by the Centers' Staffs. Therefore, the Evaluation Team relied upon its previous experience and professional judgment in the development of specific questionnaire items. Those component objectives which required the workshop participant to only "...demonstrate an understanding ..." of a career and vocational education activity or concept did not lend themselves to easy development of questionnaire items to measure the degree of accomplishment.

A questionnaire was then developed for each workshop component presented at each institution. The questionnaires covered the training objectives for each component. When

possible, the same question was utilized for more than one component which had the same objective. This procedure provided a means of collecting information which could be compared across separate components for a single institution. Also, the same question was utilized for the same component for different institutions where feasible. In some cases, the same question was utilized for several components for more than one institution.

The specific numbers of components and, therefore, the number of different questionnaires which were developed for each institution are displayed in Table 1. Individual items included in each questionnaire are displayed in the data summary tables provided in the data presentation sections of this report.

When the questionnaires were developed, they were made available for review by the appropriate Center director with a request that the Center staff also review each instrument and return them to the Evaluation Team with any comments including suggested additions, deletions, or modifications. One Evaluation Team member reviewed the applicable questionnaire with the Center Director at two of the institutions. These same two Centers also provided excellent written suggestions which were incorporated into the instruments. The third Center Director did not meet to discuss the instruments and did not provide

written suggestions on their applicability. However, insight gained from the other two Centers relative to questionnaire modifications was also incorporated into the instruments developed for the third Center. The Evaluation Team also reviewed the questionnaires with the Project Director of the State Department of Education. All questionnaires were revised to include as many suggestions as possible as well as incorporate additional questions which were deemed appropriate by the State Department of Education Project Director.

The revised questionnaires were mailed to all participants of each component at each Center for which the instruments had been developed. An appropriate cover letter from the Center Director was included which identified the Evaluation Team, the reason for the evaluation, and included a positive statement encouraging the return of the completed instrument. The participants were requested to complete the questionnaire and return it within five days in the self-addressed, postage paid, envelope provided. A list of participants for Component F at the University of Georgia was not made available to the Evaluation Team although an evaluation instrument was developed.

Control Sample Identification

During the development of the questionnaires, a letter was sent to the Contact Person identified by the State Department

of Education for each of the school districts which participated in the summer workshops. The letter requested that the Contact Person identify the name, mailing address, and job position of professional staff members in the district who did not participate in the 1972 summer workshops. The names received from this mailing served as the control group or non-participant sample which the Evaluation Team used for the purpose of comparison to the experimental group or participant sample. A non-participant sample was identified for each component at each Center for which a participant sample had been identified. There were two exceptions for which a control sample was not utilized. These exceptions included Component H at the University of Georgia (Learning Evaluation Laboratories - for vocational and technical school staffs) and the questionnaire mailed to administrators (Superintendents and Principals) of school districts which participated in the 1972 summer workshops.

The control sample received the identical questionnaire which was mailed to the workshop participants. The instructions requested respondents to omit certain questions which had been identified by the Evaluation Team as being inappropriate for non-participants. The items to omit were already identified on the questionnaires. The cover letter from the Center Directors identified the Evaluation Team, the reason for the

evaluation, and that the respondent was part of the control sample which was to be used for comparison purposes. The questionnaire, cover letter, and a return self-addressed, postage paid, envelope were mailed to the control sample with instructions to return the instrument within five days.

The numbers of questionnaires mailed to participants, non-participants, and administrators comprised a 100% sample of all participants, a 20% sample of non-participants, and a 100% sample of administrators. The numbers of responses to each mailing are displayed in Table 1 also. Responses to all mailings were generally excellent (48% return) indicating a willingness to cooperate and an interest in career and vocational education.

Administrative Questionnaire and Interview Development

The questionnaire developed for administrators focused upon the factors which might possibly prevent workshop participants from implementing all or some of the activities and procedures which were presented at the various 1972 summer workshops. These included such factors as the economic environment of the local educational agency, the amount of money available for program implementation, the degree to which persons outside of the school staff were supportive of career and vocational education, and how the summer workshops were perceived

at the local level by administrative officials. This questionnaire was also reviewed by the State Department of Education Project Director prior to mailing. The mailing procedure was identical to that of the other questionnaires with the exception of one additional procedure. All superintendents were requested to identify a convenient time when they, or a knowledgeable member of their staff, would be available for an on-site interview conducted by an Evaluation Team member. Twenty-seven superintendents responded and the Evaluation Team conducted an on-site interview with all except two of these.

Each on-site interview lasted approximately an hour and focused upon an elaboration of certain items to which the Sueerintendent responded in the questionnaire. However, the interviewers also encouraged the interviewee to discuss other points or areas of interest which the person felt were relative to the local impact of the 1972 summer workshops. The interviewer followed up on general comments with more questions in order to elicit additional comments and to more completely ascertain the condition of career and vocational education within the local educational agency.

The interviews of administrators or their representatives were conducted by members of the Evaluation Team who were totally familiar with the documentation available on the 1972 summer workshops and the procedures utilized by the Evaluation

Team for assessment of the outcomes. The interviewers were trained in the procedures employed in conducting interviews as well as the specific questions on the interview checklist. These questions were reviewed to assure that all interviewers understood the intent of the questions and could explain the question to the person being interviewed. The procedures used to record the information obtained from the interview were also reviewed. It was stressed that the interview was to be flexible in terms of the topics of discussion and that the interviewer was to follow-up on any pertinent comments made by the interviewee. The training of the interviewers was conducted just prior to the actual interview sessions. Periodic review sessions were conducted with the interviewers during the three weeks of interviews to further assure the reliability of the interview process across interviewers. These sessions provided for a discussion of the questions and procedures to be employed as well as the resolution of any potential problems which might arise during an actual interview session.

TABLE 1: NUMBER OF 1972 SUMMER WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS, NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES MAILED* AND PERCENT OF RETURNS

COMPONENT		GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE	GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
A	No. Participants	155	135	(157)**
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	87	34	78
	Percent of returns	56%	25%	50%
B	No. Participants	96	131	(157)**
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	32	67	58
	Percent of returns	33%	51%	37%
C	No. Participants	53	34	54
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	16	9	34
	Percent of returns	30%	26%	63%
D	No. Participants	24	12	55
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	15	6	41
	Percent of returns	63%	50%	75%
E	No. Participants	17	11	130
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	7	10	83
	Percent of returns	41%	91%	64%
F	No. Participants	***	N/A	****
	No. Questionnaires ret'd			
	Percent of returns			
G	No. Participants	11	N/A	12
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	5		6
	Percent of returns	45%		50%
H	No. Participants	19	N/A	N/A
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	4		
	Percent of returns	21%		
Administrators of local school districts				
	No. Participants	32	31	34
	No. Questionnaires ret'd	12	14	23
	Percent of returns	38%	45%	68%

* Questionnaires were mailed to a 100% sample of participants and administrators.

** Components A & B were combined. Questionnaires for both A & B components were mailed to participants because a revised workshop plan with new objectives was not available for assessment purposes.

*** Component F was dropped.

**** List of Workshop Participants was not made available to the Evaluation Team. Questionnaire was mailed to non-participant sample only.

Section 2 - DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Several steps were involved in the analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaires mailed to participants, non-participants, and administrators. The procedures which were utilized by the Evaluation Team are described separately for the questionnaires and the interviews in the following paragraphs.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires were logged in as they were received by the Evaluation Team. They were then sorted by institution, by component, and divided into participant and non-participant groups. The numbers of responses for each item, for each component, for each i2stitution were tabulated and percentages computed for both the participant and non-participant groups. These data are displayed on Tables 2 through 10 of this report.

Chi-square

A chi-square analysis was then made of the responses of participants (target group) and non-participants (control group) in the 1972 summer workshops. Chi-square is a statistical test which determines a comparison or relationship between numbers. It determines whether deviations between the two responding groups are due to sampling error or some interdependence or correlation among the frequencies.

Comparisons were made only when responses from both target and control groups were available. Each item in each component

for each group was analyzed to determine whether the differences that exist are due to chance or whether they are real because of factors that signify real differences between the two groups.

Probability levels were set at .05 and .01. If the result of the chi-square statistic is significant at the .05 level it is marked with one asterisk (*); at the .01 level it is marked with a double asterisk (**). When a single asterisk appears the Evaluation Team conclude with 95% probability that the differences between the target and the control group are real. Likewise a double asterisk allowed the Evaluation Team to make the same conclusion with 99% probability.

Interviews

The results of interviews were more difficult to analyze than the results of questionnaires because the interview responses were less structured due to the interviewees answering in their own words rather than selecting from among possible answers already provided. The data derived from the questionnaires provided to administrators were tabulated but the responses from the subsequent interviews were not. Instead, the Evaluation Team incorporated the interview findings directly into the data analysis narrative for objective No. 4.

Reliability

To determine the reliability of the responses to the questionnaires developed by the Evaluation Team, a test-re-test method was employed. A second set of questionnaires was mailed to a

sample of the respondents for each component at each institution approximately two weeks after the initial questionnaire was mailed. An appropriate cover letter explained the reason the individual was being asked to complete a second questionnaire and was enclosed along with a self addressed, postage paid, envelope and instructions to return the duplicate questionnaire as soon as possible. The procedure for identifying the sample for the reliability study involved the random selection of 20 respondents for each component for each institution.

The respondent questionnaires to the reliability mailing were hand scored as were the initial matching questionnaires mailed earlier. The questionnaire scores were compared using a Pearson Product Moment Correlation based upon a comparison between the score on the pre-test and the score on the identical post-test. It was determined that a high positive correlation (.873) existed bewteen the two sets of questionnaires. It can be concluded that the instruments used were highly reliable.

General Comments

As stated earlier in this report, there was a general lack of criteria for determining the level of accomplishment of each Center's workshop objectives. Poorly stated and otherwise defective objectives required the Evaluation Team to establish its own criteria of accomplishment. The statements of individual component success or failure provided in this report are based

upon the following scale of participant responses to questionnaire items.

POSITIVE ITEM RESPONSES	DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES
80% or above	Much
65-79%	Moderate
50-64%	Little
50% or below	Did not meet workshop objectives

The component questionnaires were utilized for the evaluation of workshop objectives for both process and product. The Evaluation Team could not make on-site observations during the workshops (contract for evaluation was not let until January, 1973) and did not conduct classroom visits at individual schools. Therefore, the amount of accomplishment of process objectives could only be determined by questionnaire items requiring recall on the part of the participant. Direct observation on the part of the Evaluation Team was not provided since all workshop activities were already completed by September of 1972. Questionnaire items for process and product were analyzed in an identical manner. They were given equal weight in the interpretation of the data tables and no attempt was made to separate process objectives from product objectives in the discussion of the level of accomplishment for each workshop. The reader can easily identify those questionnaire items on the data tables which were designed to measure processes at work during the summer workshops.

It will become evident to the reader that the data tables

provide a source of information in excess of that which was needed to deal with evaluation of the objectives of the three Center workshops. The tables were designed to display individual item responses for participant and non-participant groups for each summer workshop. However, comparisons could also be made of individual items which were applied to several workshops, similar workshops at more than one Center, or even all workshops at all Centers. The Evaluation Team did not make comparisons of the overall effectiveness of workshops across Centers. The narrative section of this report is limited to a discussion of individual component objectives and their degree of accomplishment only. Information gained from the administrators questionnaire and on-site interviews with superintendents is presented where appropriate in the discussion.

It should be noted that 3% of the participants said that the questionnaire was more sophisticated than the material presented at their workshop. Since the questionnaires were developed from each institutional Center's proposal, replies of this type caused the Evaluation Team to question whether or not the workshops made their presentations at the same depth which they had described in their proposals. Additional comments on this topic are provided in the section of this report dealing with the administrators questionnaire.

Section 3 - DATA PRESENTATION

This section of the report displays the tables of data which have been reduced from the questionnaires mailed to participants, non-participants, and administrators. The format for each table is identical. The questionnaire item is displayed in the first column, and the number and percentage of responses for each forced choice are displayed in the remaining columns for all three institutions. The symbol (N/A) is used where there is not any data for a particular item in a particular column.

The summer workshop programs were quite similar for Component A at all three Centers with individual differences in topics becoming more pronounced from Component C through Component H. Summer Workshops for Components F, G, and H were not held at all three Centers. This was part of the original planning for each institution.

The tables displayed in this section deal with Components A through H and the administrators' questionnaire. The interpretations of the tables and supporting narrative are presented separately for each institution in the report sections following the tables.

TABLE 2 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT A: FUSING CONCEPTS OF SELF AND CAREER AWARENESS

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N=87 Target		N=34 Control		N=33 Target		N=33 Control		N=78 Target		N=48 Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. CAREER ORIENTED ACTIVITIES												
1. Career oriented activities were___ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	44	45%	N/A		14	42%	N/A		31	38%	N/A	
developed	54	55%			20	58%			51	62%		
no response	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%		
2. The career oriented activities which I have used with my students included												
plays	20	8%	4	6%								
role playing	61	23%	15	23%								
speeches	33	13%	3	5%								
field trips	61	23%	23	34%		N/A				N/A		
resource persons	77	30%	20	30%								
other	8	3%	1	2%								
no response	0	0%	0	0%								
3. I have developed ___ career oriented activities **												
0	2	2%	4	12%	4	12%	13	40%	5	7%	9	21%
1	7	8%	4	12%	3	9%	1	3%	4	5%	2	5%
2	8	9%	6	18%	5	15%	4	12%	12	15%	1	2%
3	11	13%	9	25%	8	25%	2	6%	11	14%	3	7%
4	13	15%	3	9%	5	15%	2	6%	17	22%	9	21%
5	7	8%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	6	7%	7	16%
6	8	9%	0	0%	1	3%	2	6%	4	5%	3	7%
more than 6	26	30%	4	12%	4	12%	3	9%	20	25%	9	21%
no response	5	6%	4	12%	3	9%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. The activities that were designed and implemented were suited for my grade level		*				*				**		
yes	82	95%	26	76%	27	82%	17	52%	73	94%	34	71%
no	2	2%	3	9%	0	0%	3	9%	1	1%	2	4%
no response	3	3%	5	15%	6	18%	13	39%	4	5%	12	25%
5. The degree of student interest in these activities was				*								**
none	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	2%
little	19	25%	9	26%	0	0%	2	6%	4	5%	0	0%
average	24	32%	4	12%	8	25%	5	15%	25	33%	14	29%
much	25	30%	10	30%	12	36%	7	21%	25	33%	16	34%
great	0	0%	0	0%	7	21%	5	15%	18	24%	3	6%
no response	10	13%	11	32%	6	18%	14	43%	3	4%	14	29%
6. These activities met the individual needs of students				**								*
yes	79	91%	22	65%	23	69%	17	52%	63	83%	30	63%
no	1	1%	3	9%	2	6%	2	6%	5	6%	3	6%
no response	7	8%	9	26%	8	25%	14	42%	8	11%	15	31%
7. These activities are:				*				*				**
fine as written	40	46%	12	35%	9	28%	6	18%	22	30%	9	19%
need some revision	41	47%	13	38%	18	54%	9	27%	47	64%	18	38%
should be completely revised	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	4	5%	0	0%
no response	6	7%	9	27%	6	18%	16	49%	1	1%	21	43%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
B. IMPORTANCE OF CAREER EDUCATION												
1. Career Education in the elemtary school is an important preparation for vocational choice												
agree					32	97%	28	85%				
disagree		N/A			0	0%	5	15%		N/A		
no response					1	3%	0	0%				
2. Visits to industries and businesses give insight into the world of work												
agree					32	97%	33	100%				
disagree		N/A			0	0%	0	0%		N/A		
no response					1	3%	0	0%				
3. Interviewing workers provides knowledge of job requirements and job satisfactions which the teacher can communicate to students												
agree					30	90%	32	97%				
disagree		N/A			0	0%	1	3%		N/A		
no response					3	10%	0	0%				
C. "INTERLOCKING" OR "FUSING" GUIDES												
1. The purpose of an interlocking guide for career oriented activities was ____ during the Summer Workshop												
presented	40	46%			5	15%			36	43%		
developed	38	43%			27	79%			45	55%		
not discussed	0	0%		N/A	0	0%		N/A	0	0%		N/A
other	1	1%			1	3%			2	2%		
no response	9	10%			1	3%			0	0%		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. An interlocking guide was completed for career oriented activities in which I had		**				**				**		
little input	16	18%	9	26%	2	6%	12	37%	11	14%	10	21%
moderate input	34	39%	4	12%	11	34%	9	27%	39	50%	14	29%
great input	27	31%	3	9	16	48%	2	6%	23	30%	9	19%
no response	10	12%	14	41%	4	12%	10	31%	5	6	15	31%
3. A guide for career oriented activities was developed during the school year						*				**		
yes					16	48%	10	30%	39	50%	29	60%
no		N/A			14	43%	11	33%	40	50%	10	21%
no response					3	9%	12	31%	0	0%	9	19%
4. The finished interlocking guide offered		**										
more than 20 activities	40	47%	0	0%					30	38%	17	35%
about 15 activities	21	24%	5	15%					14	18%	12	25%
about 10 activities	8	9%	4	12%		N/A			17	22%	10	21%
less than 10 activities	4	5%	6	18%					9	12%	2	4%
no response	13	15%	19	55%					8	10%	7	15%
D. IMPLEMENTATION OF GUIDE												
1. The interlocking guide developed did integrate career activities with the established curriculum.												
yes	74	85%	14	41%					63	81%	34	71%
No	4	5%	4	12%					3	4%	1	2%
no response	9	10%	16	47%					12	15%	13	27%

* p .05
** p .01

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Plans for implementing the interlocking guide were ___ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	47	53%										
developed	36	41%										
not discussed	4	4%	N/A		N/A				N/A			
other	2	2%										
no response	0	0%										
3. A plan has been developed for implementing the interlocking guide				**						**		
yes	52	60%	5	15%					46	59%	30	63%
no	17	20%	12	35%	N/A				25	32%	5	10%
no response	18	20%	17	50%					7	9%	13	27%
4. The plan is flexible enough to deal with different areas of specialization				**								
yes	60	69%	13	38%					59	75%	31	65%
no	7	8%	4	12%	N/A				9	12%	3	6%
no response	20	23%	17	50%					10	13%	14	29%
5. A plan for implementing the interlocking guide has been used this year										**		
yes	52	60%	6	18%					41	53%	29	60%
no	17	20%	10	29%					28	36%	6	13%
no response	18	20%	18	53%	N/A				9	11%	13	27%

* p .05
** p .01

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
E. CAREER INFORMATION UNITS												
1. Career information units or packets were ____ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	36	36%			4	12%						
developed	62	62%			26	78%						
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		1	3%	N/A		N/A			
other	2	2%			0	0%						
no response	0	0%			2	7%						
2. I have developed career information units or packets				**								
yes	73	84%	13	38%	6	28%	12	36%				
no	11	13%	18	53%	10	48%	11	33%	N/A			
no response	3	3%	3	9%	5	24%	10	31%				
3. The materials, directions, and information in the units or packets are designed to be used in a school setting												
yes	76	87%	15	44%								
no	5	6%	7	21%		N/A			N/A			
no response	6	7%	12	35%								
4. I have tried career information units or packets in classrooms				**		**						
yes	72	83%	18	53%	9	52%	16	89%				
no	7	8%	12	35%	8	32%	2	11%				
no response	8	9%	4	12%	4	16%	0	0%				

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
F. GROUP GUIDANCE ACTIVITIES												
1. Group guidance activities were ____ at the summer workshop.												
presented	43	43%			7	33%			35	45%		
developed	55	55%			7	33%			26	33%		
not discussed	2	2%	N/A		4	20%	N/A		15	19%	N/A	
other	0	0%			1	4%			0	0%		
no response	0	0%			2	10%			2	3%		
2. Check the group activities which have been planned as part of the group guidance program.										**		
interviews	61	19%	12	17%	11	18%	6	13%	41	18%	19	18%
paper and pencil tests	50	16%	9	13%	5	8%	4	9%	18	8%	10	9%
standardized tests	20	6%	2	3%	8	13%	6	13%	32	14%	34	32%
group counseling sessions	36	11%	9	13%	15	24%	12	27%	60	27%	1	1%
field trips	66	21%	20	27%	1	1%	1	2%	9	4%	30	28%
seminars	22	7%	2	3%	16	26%	13	29%	59	26%	3	3%
guest speakers	63	20%	17	24%	5	8%	3	7%	4	2%	0	0%
other	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
3. Check the group activities which have been implemented as part of the group guidance program.										**		
paper and pencil tests	41	15%	5	9%					33	18%	17	17%
standardized tests	24	8%	4	7%					15	8%	7	7%
group counseling sessions	32	11%	7	12%					27	15%	33	33%
field trips	56	20%	16	28%					44	24%	1	0%
seminars	17	6%	3	5%		N/A			8	4%	30	30%
guest speakers	55	20%	8	14%					48	26%	4	4%
other	5	2%	0	0%					2	1%	0	0%
interviews	51	19%	19	25%					0	0%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	0	0%					9	4%	2	2%

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
G. INDIVIDUAL GUIDANCE ACTIVITIES												
1. Individual guidance activities were ____ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	46	52%			12	57%						
developed	37	41%			3	15%						
not discussed	6	7%	N/A		4	19%	N/A		N/A			
other	0	0%			0	0%						
no response	0	0%			2	9%						
2. Check the individual guidance activities which have been planned as part of the guidance program.			**				*					
interviews	53	26%	12	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
individual counseling	43	29%	4	12%	14	40%	8	24%	46	43%	16	33%
aptitude testing	18	12%	5	15%	5	14%	7	22%	23	22%	10	21%
personality inventories	30	20%	6	17%	12	34%	8	24%	28	26%	14	29%
other	4	3%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	4	4%	1	2%
no response	0	0%	7	21%	2	6%	10	30%	5	5%	7	15%
3. Check the individual guidance activities which have been implemented as part of the guidance program.			**									
interviews	52	37%	8	23%								
individual counseling	35	25%	5	15%					50	47%	13	38%
aptitude testing	19	13%	2	6%					21	20%	8	24%
personality inventories	32	22%	5	15%		N/A			28	27%	12	35%
other	5	3%	2	6%					6	6%	1	3%
no response	0	0%	12	35%					0	0%	0	0%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
H. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION												
1. Systems for delivering career information to students were ___ at the Summer Work shop.												
presented	39	48%			12	48%						
developed	38	46%			10	40%						
not discussed	3	4%		N/A	1	4%		N/A		N/A		
other	2	2%			0	0%						
no response	0	0%			2	8%						
2. I h-ve developed a workable system for delivery of career information to students.				*				**				
yes	54	62%	12	35%	13	62%	7	21%				
no	14	16%	13	38%	5	24%	10	30%		N/A		
no response	19	22%	9	27%	3	14%	16	49%				
3. I have assisted classroom teachers in the classroom in dissemination of career education information.												
yes	54	62%										
no	23	26%		N/A		N/A				N/A		
no response	10	12%										
4. Provisions have been made for updating the information to te presented to students.				*				**				
yes	55	63%	13	38%	13	62%	6	18%				
no	22	25%	17	50%	5	24%	10	30%				
no response	10	12%	4	12%	3	14%	17	52%				

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
I. TEAM ACTIVITIES												
1. Team activities to assist teachers in implementing career oriented activities were ___ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	54	59%			19	57%						
developed	35	38%			7	22%						
not discussed	3	3%	N/A		4	12%	N/A		N/A			
other	0	0%			2	6%						
no response	0	0%			1	3%						
2. In-service activities are a valuable experience.												
yes					29	88%	1	13%				
no	N/A		N/A		1	3%	0	0%	N/A			
no response					3	9%	7	87%				
3. Working as a team is a more productive method of accomplishing goals than working alone.												
agree					28	85%	29	77%				
disagree	N/A		N/A		3	9%	0	0%	N/A			
no response					2	6%	4	23%				
4. Check the team activities which have been developed to assist teachers in implementing career oriented activities in classrooms.												
team planning	52	28%	20	41%								
materials development	51	27%	8	16%								
team teaching	29	15%	11	23%								
in-service training	53	29%	10	20%	N/A		N/A		N/A			
other	2	1%	0	0%								
no response	0	0%	0	0%								

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
I. TEAM ACTIVITIES (Continued)												
5. Check the kind of background materials which are available for conducting team activities.												
handbook	48	20%	15	21%								
films	60	25%	15	21%								
transparancies	30	12%	9	13%								
audio tape	28	11%	8	11%	N/A				N/A			
video tape	17	7%	5	7%								
instructional materials	57	23%	16	22%								
other	5	2%	4	5%								
J. CONSULTANTS												
1. I had ___ contacts with career consultants during the school year			*				**					
0	1	1%	6	22%	3	9%	16	46%	19	23%	21	50%
1	11	14%	6	22%	9	27%	4	12%	21	26%	8	20%
2	8	11%	3	11%	7	21%	1	3%	18	22%	5	12%
3	19	25%	5	18%	8	25%	2	6%	8	10%	4	10%
4	18	24%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	6	7%	1	2%
5	9	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	5%
6	4	5%	1	4%	2	6%	2	6%	3	4%	0	0%
more than 6	6	8%	1	4%	3	9%	2	6%	5	6%	1	1%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	6	18%	0	0%	0	0%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
J. CONSULTANTS (Continued)												
2. Career education consultants visited my school to												
follow up on Summer Workshop activities	69	44%			21	45%			53	39%		
respond to a specific request for assistance	22	14%			7	15%			28	21%		
generally review the use of Summer Workshop activities	52	33%	N/A		13	27%	N/A		27	20%	N/A	
do not know	4	2%			4	9%			12	9%		
other	11	7%			0	0%			16	11%		
no response	0	0%			2	4%			0	0%		
3. As a result of the professional direction and guidance of consultants, I feel more comfortable in dealing with the needs of special students.								*				
agree					19	57%	15	45%				
disagree		N/A			11	34%	5	15%		N/A		
no response					3	9%	13	40%				
K. MEANING OF CAREER EDUCATION												
1. The fundamental concept of career education is that all types of educational experiences, curriculum, instruction, and counseling should involve preparation for								*				
economic independence					12	28%	7	17%				
personal fulfillment		N/A			7	17%	20	49%		N/A		
appreciation for the dignity of work					21	49%	14	34%				
none of the above					2	6%	0	0%				

* $p < .05$

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
K. MEANING OF CAREER EDUCATION (Continued)												
2. Career education is concerned with												
preserving what is good in career preparation					6	13%	8	20%				
giving new structure to the curriculum		N/A			8	16%	7	18%		N/A		
correlate the subject matter curriculum with the world of work					32	69%	25	62%				
none of the above					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					1	2%	0	0%				

TABLE 3 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT B: INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM DEVELOPMENT

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N=32 Target		N=20 Control		N=67 Target		N=24 Control		N=58 Target		N=21 Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. HANDICAPPED AND DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS												
1. Procedures for identifying handicapped and disadvantaged students were ____ at the W.S.												
presented	26	70%							46	79%		
developed	9	24%							10	17%		
not discussed	1	3%	N/A		N/A				2	4%	N/A	
other	0	0%							0	0%		
no response	1	3%							0	0%		
2. What methods have been used to identify "in writing" handicapped and disadvantaged students?												
anecdotal records	17	23%	6	14%					12	23%	6	18%
check list	9	12%	7	17%					22	23%	3	9%
case studies	13	18%	6	14%					15	16%	6	18%
interviews	13	18%	10	24%	N/A				18	18%	9	28%
questionnaires	16	22%	7	17%					17	17%	6	18%
other	3	4%	2	5%					3	3%	3	9%
no response	2	3%	4	9%					0	0%	0	0%
3. Check the kinds of standardized tests which were used to distinguish disadvantaged and handicapped students from other students.												
I.Q.	19	30%	14	39%								
personality inventories	10	16%	4	11%								
aptitude tests	13	20%	7	19%	N/A				N/A			
psychological tests	9	13%	5	14%								
other	7	11%	4	11%								
no response	5	10%	2	6%								

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. Instruments were developed to assess disadvantaged and handicapped students.												
yes	11	33%	7	35%								
no	18	55%	8	40%	N/A				N/A			
no response	4	12%	5	25%								
5. Provisions were made for medical exams of physically handicapped students.												
yes	8	24%	10	50%								
no	19	58%	5	25%	N/A				N/A			
no response	6	18%	5	25%								
6. Test results confirm other information compiled about disadvantaged and handicapped students. *												
yes	15	50%	16	80%								
no	7	22%	0	0%	N/A				N/A			
no response	9	28%	4	20%								
7. I have prepared ___ individualized learning activities to meet the career orientation needs of disadvantaged students.												
0	6	18%	5	25%	18	28%	9	34%	13	22%	5	24%
1	1	3%	1	5%	3	4%	0	0%	3	5%	3	14%
2	1	3%	1	5%	5	7%	4	15%	5	9%	1	5%
3	4	11%	2	10%	3	4%	2	8%	3	5%	1	5%
4	4	11%	0	0%	11	16%	3	12%	8	13%	0	0%
5	3	9%	1	5%	3	4%	1	4%	4	7%	2	9%
6	2	6%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%
more than 6	6	18%	7	35%	14	21%	3	12%	21	35%	6	29%
no response	7	21%	3	15%	8	12%	4	15%	1	1%	3	14%

* $p < .05$

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
8 I have developed ___ individualized learning activities to meet the career orientation needs of handicapped students.												
0	13	41%	7	35%	29	43%			33	62%	10	49%
1	0	0%	1	5%	1	2%			0	0%	1	5%
2	1	3%	1	5%	5	7%			2	4%	1	5%
3	1	3%	4	20%	4	6%	N/A		0	0%	2	9%
4	1	3%	0	0%	6	9%			6	11%	0	0%
5	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%			2	4%	1	5%
6	3	9%	2	10%	3	5%			1	2%	0	0%
more than 6	5	16%	3	15%	10	15%			5	10%	2	9%
no response	8	25%	2	10%	7	11%			4	7%	4	18%
9. I have implemented individualized learning activities with disadvantaged students												
yes	22	68%	12	60%					23	43%	10	49%
no	6	19%	4	20%	N/A		N/A		4	8%	0	0%
no response	4	13%	4	20%					26	49%	11	51%
10. I have implemented individualized learning activities with handicapped students.												
yes	7	22%	7	35%					8	15%	5	10%
no	21	65%	8	40%		N/A			10	19%	2	4%
no response	4	13%	5	25%					35	66%	41	86%
B. CAREER EDUCATION LEARNING ACTIVITIES												
1. Individualized learning activities/units for career orientation were ___ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	19	37%			12	18%			30	54%		
developed	19	37%			55	81%			23	41%		
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		0	0%	N/A		2	3%	N/A	
other	6	12%			0	0%			1	2%		
no response	7	14%			1	1%			0	0%		

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. The individualized learning activities/units provide properly sequenced materials												
yes	24	74%	12	60%	37	55%	16	67%	25	47%	10	49%
no	4	13%	3	15%	4	6%	3	13%	4	8%	1	2%
no response	4	13%	5	25%	26	39%	5	20%	24	45%	10	49%
3. The individualized learning activities/units are multi-media, i.e. texts, transparencies, tapes, magazine articles.						*						
yes	22	68%	13	65%	37	56%	14	58%	27	51%	8	38%
no	5	16%	2	10%	5	7%	6	25%	11	21%	3	13%
no response	5	16%	5	25%	25	37%	4	17%	15	28%	10	49%
4. Individualized learning activities/units have been developed for academic subject areas related to the vocational interest of students.						*						
yes	22	68%	15	75%	39	59%	15	63%	29	54%	10	49%
no	6	19%	1	5%	3	4%	5	70%	1	2%	1	2%
no response	4	13%	4	20%	25	37%	4	17%	24	44%	10	49%
5. Interim objectives have been included which lead to the successful conclusion of the terminal objectives of the learning activities.						**						
yes	22	69%	10	50%	39	58%	15	63%	27	51%	12	60%
no	2	6%	2	10%	2	3%	5	20%	3	6%	1	2%
no response	8	25%	8	40%	26	39%	4	17%	23	43%	8	38%
6. Learning activities can be revised and updated easily.						**				*		
yes	26	81%	16	80%	43	64%	17	71%	26	49%	9	47%
no	2	6%	1	5%	0	0%	3	12%	1	2%	1	2%
no response	4	13%	3	15%	24	36%	4	17%	26	49%	11	51%

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
C. CATALOGUE OF CAREERS												
1. Procedures for developing a catalogue of courses and course prerequisites were ____ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	11	32%										
developed	6	18%										
not discussed	13	38%	N/A		N/A				N/A			
other	0	0%										
no response	4	12%										
2. All courses offered under the title of vocational, pre-vocational and academic subject areas in my school system have been listed in a logical order												
yes	19	60%	14	70%								
no	10	31%	5	25%	N/A				N/A			
no response	3	9%	1	5%								
3. Prerequisites for these courses have been established												
yes	18	56%	11	55%								
no	10	31%	7	35%	N/A				N/A			
no response	4	13%	2	10%								
4. Course offerings provide options and alternatives for students												
yes	22	69%	14	70%								
no	4	13%	5	25%	N/A				N/A			
no response	6	18%	1	5%								
5. A catalogue of courses with descriptions has or will be published												
yes	20	63%	9	45%								
no	11	34%	6	30%	N/A				N/A			
no response	1	3%	5	25%								

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target		Control		Target	Control	Target	Control
	n	%	n	%	n %	n %	n %	n %
6 The catalogue is available to								
students	17	20%	9	19%				
teachers	19	23%	9	19%				
parents	16	19%	8	17%				
employers	10	12%	4	9%	N/A		N/A	
other school systems	14	16%	6	13%				
other	1	1%	0	0%				
no response	8	9%	11	23%				
D. DEFINITION OF TERMS								
1. Check the terms for which definitions have been developed as a result of the Summer Workshop in career education								
disadvantaged student	26	15%	8	10%				
handicapped student	22	13%	8	10%				
vocational subjects	22	13%	10	13%				
pre-vocational subjects	15	9%	10	13%				
academic subjects	19	11%	9	12%	N/A		N/A	
interlocking	25	14%	9	12%				
individualized instruction	19	11%	7	9%				
systems approach to problem solving.	9	5%	4	5%				
local guide	11	6%	3	4%				
no response	5	3%	9	12%				
2. Definitions were developed by a group within the school or school system								
yes	15	47%	9	45%				
no	10	31%	3	15%	N/A		N/A	
no response	7	22%	8	40%				

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
E. CURRICULUM PLANNING ACTIVITIES												
1. Procedures for curriculum planning activities were ____ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	15	41%										
developed	17	46%										
not discussed	3	8%	N/A		N/A				N/A			
other	0	0%										
no response	2	5%										
2. I have been actively involved in curriculum planning activities												
yes	24	75%	9	45%								
no	5	16%	6	30%	N/A				N/A			
no response	3	9%	5	25%								
3. What are the outcomes of curriculum planning												
goal definitions	18	16%	11	18%								
course objectives	21	19%	11	18%								
course outlines	21	19%	9	15%								
materials selection	17	15%	11	18%								
materials development	12	11%	6	9%								
individualized learning activities developed	15	14%	6	9%								
other	1	1%	0	0%								
no response	6	5%	8	13%								

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
F. INTERLOCKING GUIDES												
1. Guides for interlocking the academic, pre-vocational and vocational curriculum were ____ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	15	47%										
developed	14	44%										
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A				N/A			
other	0	0%										
no response	3	9%										
2. I have contributed to the development of a local guide for interlocking the academic, pre-vocational and vocational curriculum												
writing philosophy and/or goal statements	8	15%	4	13%								
developing objectives related to goals/philosophy	14	26%	3	10%	N/A				N/A			
developed guidelines	7	13%	5	16%								
implemented guidelines	8	15%	2	6%								
other	2	4%	3	10%								
no response	15	27%	14	45%								
3. I have had ___ input into the guidelines												
little	13	40%	6	30%								
moderate	5	19%	6	30%	N/A				N/A			
great	4	13%	0	0%								
no response	9	28%	8	40%								
4. The guidelines are flexible enough to deal with different areas of specialization												
yes	17	54%	9	45%								
no	2	6%	2	10%								
no response	13	40%	9	45%								

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. I helped prepare a local fusing guide to interlock subject matter with the World of Work												
yes					22	33%	4	17%				
no	N/A				39	58%	13	54%	N/A			
no response					6	9%	7	29%				
7. I have found the fusing guide helpful in planning for my students												
yes	N/A				19	28%	5	20%	N/A			
no					4	6%	3	13%				
no response					44	66%	16	67%				
8. Other teachers in my school have used this fusing guide												
yes					19	28%	5	20%				
no					4	6%	3	13%				
no response					44	66%	16	67%				
G. CONSULTANTS												
1. I had ___ contacts with career education consultants during the school year						*				**		
0	5	16%	3	15%	9	13%	8	34%	5	9%	9	19%
1	8	26%	0	0%	12	18%	0	0%	5	9%	1	2%
2	7	22%	1	5%	12	18%	6	25%	13	22%	1	2%
3	2	6%	5	25%	12	18%	1	4%	4	7%	0	0%
4	3	9%	4	20%	6	9%	0	0%	9	15%	3	6%
5	1	3%	0	0%	2	3%	1	4%	5	10%	2	4%
6	0	0%	1	5%	2	3%	1	4%	2	4%	1	2%
more than 6	3	9%	2	10%	0	0%	1	4%	7	12%	0	0%
no response	3	9%	4	20%	12	18%	6	25%	7	12%	37	65%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Career education consultants visited my school to:												
follow up on summer workshop activities	20	44%			41	45%			37	43%		
respond to a specific request for assistance	4	8%			18	20%			15	17%		
generally review the use of Summer Workshop activities	13	29%	N/A		13	14%	N/A		28	32%	N/A	
do not know	4	8%			10	11%			3	4%		
other	2	4%			4	4%			3	4%		
no response	3	7%			6	6%			0	0%		
H. IMPORTANCE OF CARIER EDUCATION												
1. Career education in the elementary school is an important preparation for vocational choice.												
agree					62	93%	20	84%				
disagree		N/A			5	7%	2	8%		N/A		
no response					0	0%	2	8%				
I. TEAM ACTIVITIES												
1. Procedures for teamwork were ____ during the Summer Workshop												
presented					17	28%			37	73%		
developed					38	63%			18	27%		
not discussed		N/A			2	3%	N/A		0	0%	N/A	
other					4	6%			0	0%		
no response					0	0%			0	0%		

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. In-service team activities proved to be a valuable experience												
yes					50	75%	15	63%				
no	N/A				7	10%	2	8%	N/A			
no response					10	15%	7	29%				
3. Working as a team is a more productive method of accomplishing goals than working alone										**		
yes					54	81%	18	75%	48	90%	12	25%
no	N/A				7	10%	2	8%	2	4%	3	6%
no response					6	9%	4	17%	3	6%	33	69%
4. A team is working within my school to implement career education activities										**		
yes									50	94%	16	33%
no	N/A				N/A				3	6%	1	2%
no response									0	0%	31	65%
5. The team is relating aspects of the academic and vocational programs										*		
yes									49	92%	15	31%
no	N/A				N/A				4	8%	1	2%
no response									0	0%	32	67%
J. MEANING OF CAREER EDUCATION												
1. The fundamental concept of career education is that alltypes of educational experiences, curriculum, instruction, and counseling should involve preparation for:												
economic independence					34	26%	8	24%				
personal fulfillment					40	31%	14	41%				
appreciation for the dignity of work.	N/A				53	40%	12	35%	N/A			
none of the above					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					4	3%	0	0%				

* p .05
** p .01

TABLE 4 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT C: MANAGING CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N=16 Target		N=15 Control		N=9 Target		N=4 Control		N=34 Target		N=2 Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. WRITTEN STATEMENTS OF PURPOSE												
1. Written statements of the purposes of career education were___at the Summer Workshop												
presented	6	37%										
developed	8	50%										
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A				N/A			
other	0	0%										
no response	2	13%										
2. I have assisted in the development of written statements of the purposes of career education												
yes	12	75%	7	46%								
no	4	25%	4	27%	N/A				N/A			
no response	0	0%	4	27%								
3. These statements reflect the relationship of career education to the total educational program of the district.				**								
yes	16	100%	9	60%								
no	0	0%	0	0%	N/A				N/A			
no response	0	0%	6	40%								

** $p < .05$

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
B. PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING OBSERVATIONS												
1. Procedures for developing observations of classroom teaching situations were___ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	7	43%			5	56%			22	65%		
developed	6	38%			0	0%			2	6%		
not discussed	3	19%			4	44%			1	3%		
other	0	0%			0	0%			9	26%		
2. The procedures used to develop observations of classroom teaching situations were:												
development of a questionnaire	3	12%	3	14%					9	19%	2	40%
group seminar (brainstorming	8	32%	7	31%					17	36%	2	40%
review of literature	4	16%	3	14%					6	13%	0	0%
selection of existing observation forms	5	20%	3	14%		N/A			8	17%	0	0%
other	0	0%	0	0%					6	13%	1	20%
no response	5	20%	6	27%					1	2%	0	0%
3. I had ___ input in the development of observation procedures												
little	4	25%	4	27%					17	50%	1	50%
moderate	7	44%	5	33%		N/A			12	35%	0	0%
great	2	13%	2	13%					2	7%	1	50%
no response	3	18%	4	27%					3	8%	0	0%

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. The procedures used during the year to identify teacher competencies were												
observation of classrooms. . . .	15	25%	8	25%	9	38%	3	34%	25	30%	2	25%
student questionnaire.	2	5%	3	9%	2	8%	0	0%	6	7%	0	0%
review of current teacher. . . . evaluations.	10	17%	5	16%	2	8%	2	22%	9	12%	0	0%
review of literature	6	10%	3	9%	1	4%	2	22%	7	8%	2	25%
teacher interview.	11	19%	6	19%	8	34%	2	22%	21	25%	2	25%
test of student knowledge. . . .	9	15%	4	13%	2	8%	0	0%	9	12%	2	25%
teacher questionnaire.	4	7%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	4	5%	0	0%
other	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
no response.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
5. The procedures which were most helpful in assessing the effectiveness of teaching strategies to develop a student's awareness of himself were												
observations of classrooms . . .					8	40%	3	38%	25	32%	1	50%
teacher questionnaire.					1	5%	0	0%	4	5%	0	0%
review of current teacher evaluations.					2	10%	1	12%	6	8%	0	0%
teacher interview.		N/A			4	20%	1	12%	17	22%	0	0%
test of student knowledge. . . .					4	20%	2	26%	8	11%	0	0%
review of literature					1	5%	1	12%	4	5%	0	0%
student questionnaire.					0	0%	0	0%	11	14%	1	50%
other					0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%
no response.					0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
C. MANAGEMENT GUIDE												
1. A management model for managing career and vocational educational programs was ___ at the Summer Workshop		**										
presented	3	17%	2	13%	2	22%			25	73%		
developed	12	75%	4	27%	3	34%			6	18%		
not discussed	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	N/A		0	0%	N/A	
other	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%			3	9%		
no response	1	8%	9	60%	1	11%			0	0%		
2. A management guide for implementing career education was ___ in the Summer Workshop												
presented	6	35%										
developed	11	65%										
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A				N/A			
other	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
3. The management guide follows a sequential order.		*										
yes	15	93%	9	60%	5	55%	1	25%				
no	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%		N/A		
no response	1	7%	6	40%	3	34%	3	75%				
4. The management guide defines realistic time lines to accomplish tasks												
yes	13	82%	8	53%	5	55%	1	25%				
no	1	6%	1	7%	1	11%	0	0%		N/A		
no response	2	12%	6	40%	3	34%	3	75%				

* P. 4. 05
** P 4. 01

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5. The management guide provides a number of alternatives												
yes	13	82%	8	53%	4	44%	1	25%				
no	2	6%	1	7%	2	22%	0	0%		N/A		
no response	1	12%	6	40%	3	34%	3	75%				
6. Provisions have been made for updating and revising the management guide *												
yes	13	82%	7	46%	4	44%	1	25%				
no	2	12%	1	8%	2	22%	0	0%		N/A		
no response	1	6%	7	46%	3	34%	3	75%				
7. The management guide is available to school staff members												
yes	11	69%	9	60%	4	44%	1	25%	23	67%	1	50%
no	4	25%	2	13%	1	12%	0	0%	9	26%	1	50%
no response	1	6%	4	27%	4	44%	3	75%	2	7%	0	0%
8. The management guide is being used by school staff members *												
yes	9	56%	6	40%	4	44%	1	25%				
no	5	32%	1	7%	1	12%	0	0%		N/A		
no response	2	12%	8	53%	4	44%	3	75%				
9. I have assisted in the development of a local management guide												
yes									21	62%	1	50%
no		N/A				N/A			13	38%	1	50%
10. I had ___ input into the development of this guide												
little									10	29%	1	50%
moderate		N/A				N/A			11	32%	0	0%
great									7	21%	1	50%
no response									6	18%	0	0%

* p < .05
** p .01

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
11. The guide is flexible enough to deal with different areas of specialization												
yes									23	67%	2	50%
no	N/A				N/A				7	19%	0	0%
no response									4	14%	0	0%
12. A management guide for implementing career education was developed												
yes					5	55%	1	25%				
no	N/A				4	45%	3	75%	N/A			
no response					0	0%	0	0%				
D. PLANS FOR IN-SERVICE TRAINING												
1. Plans for in-service training were ___ at the Summer Workshop												
presented	10	59%			5	42%			30	84%		
developed	7	41%			4	33%			3	8%		
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		2	17%	N/A		3	8%	N/A	
other	0	0%			1	8%			0	0%		
no response	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%		
2. Plans have been prepared for in-service training programs *												
yes	15	93%	8	53%	5	56%	2	50%	23	67%	1	50%
no	1	7%	2	13%	3	33%	0	0%	6	18%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	5	34%	1	11%	2	50%	5	15%	1	50%
3. These plans provide for sufficient time to conduct the in-service programs												
yes	14	86%	9	60%	5	56%	2	50%	22	65%	1	50%
no	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%
no response	1	7%	5	33%	4	44%	2	50%	10	29%	1	50%

* $p < .05$

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. Plans have been designed to create an orderly presentation of program objectives *												
yes	15	93%	8	53%	4	44%	2	50%	25	73%	1	50%
no	0	0%	2	14%	1	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	1	7%	5	33%	4	44%	2	50%	9	27%	1	50%
5. Plans provide for interactive communication between trainer and trainee in in-service programs * *												
yes	15	93%	7	46%	5	56%	2	50%	23	67%	1	50%
no	0	0%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	1	7%	6	40%	4	44%	2	50%	11	33%	1	50%
6. In-service training plans have been implemented during the school year *												
yes	15	93%	10	67%	4	44%	2	50%	25	73%	1	50%
no	1	7%	0	0%	1	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	5	33%	4	44%	2	50%	9	27%	1	50%
7. In-service training as provided, appeared to meet the needs of teachers												
yes					4	44%	2	50%	23	67%	1	50%
no		N/A			1	12%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
no response					4	44%	2	50%	10	29%	1	50%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
E. CONSULTANTS												
1. I have had ____ contacts with career education consultants during the school year										**		
0	1	7%	1	6%	1	12%	2	50%	2	5%	0	0%
1	2	12%	0	0%	1	11%	1	25%	3	8%	0	0%
2	2	12%	2	13%	1	11%	0	0%	5	15%	0	0%
3	3	19%	5	34%	2	22%	1	25%	6	18%	0	0%
4	3	19%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	5	15%	1	50%
5	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%
6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
more than 6	3	19%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	11	29%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	5	34%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
2. Career Education consultants visited my school to												
follow up on Summer Workshop practices	14	40%			7	41%			31	34%		
respond to specific requests for assistance	8	23%			5	29%			23	26%		
generally review use of Summer Workshop activities	10	29%	N/A		2	12%	N/A		19	21%	N/A	
do not know	2	6%			2	12%			4	4%		
other	1	2%			1	6%			13	15%		
no response	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%		
F. IMPORTANCE OF CAREER EDUCATION												
1. Career education in the elementary school is an important preparation for vocational choice												
agree					8	89%	4	100%				
disagree			N/A		1	11%	0	0%		N/A		
no response					0	0%	0	0%				

** p < .01

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Visits to industries and businesses give insight into the world of work												
agree					9	100%	4	100%				
disagree	N/A				0	0%	0	0%	N/A			
no response					0	0%	0	0%				
3. Interviewing workers provides knowledge of job requirements and job satisfactions which the teacher can communicate to students												
agree					8	89%	4	100%				
disagree	N/A				1	11%	0	0%	N/A			
no response					0	0%	0	0%				
G. MEANING OF CAREER EDUCATION												
1. The fundamental concept of career education is that all types of educational experiences, curriculum, instruction, and counseling should involve preparation for												
economic independence									16	24%	2	50%
personal fulfillment									25	38%	1	25%
appreciation for the dignity of work	N/A				N/A				24	36%	1	25%
none of the above									1	2%	0	0%
no response									0	0%	0	0%
2. Career education is concerned with												
preserving what is good in career preparation									11	19%	1	25%
giving new structure to the curriculum	N/A				N/A				13	22%	1	25%
understanding and relating man with the world of work									35	59%	2	50%
none of the above									0	0%	0	0%
no response									0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
H. ROLE OF GUIDANCE PERSONNEL												
1. Possible ways that guidance personnel can assist classroom teachers was ____ during the Summer Workshop												
presented									29	78%		
developed									4	11%		
not discussed		N/A				N/A			1	3%		N/A
other									3	8%		
no response									0	0%		
2. Check the ways guidance personnel can assist the classroom teacher in implementing career education												
developing instructional activities									9	10%	1	12%
providing resources									22	23%	2	25%
conducting group activities		N/A				N/A			19	20%	1	13%
providing individual guidance to students									28	30%	2	25%
developing guides for integrating career education into the curriculum									16	17%	2	25%

TABLE 5 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT D: JOB PLACEMENT

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY GEORGIA		
	N =15 Target		N=12 Control		N=6 Target		N=8 Control		N=41 Target		N= Cor
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
A. RATIONALE FOR OPERATION OF JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAMS											
1. Possible rationales for the operation of Job Placement Programs were ___ during the Summer Workshop											
presented	5	32%			3	52%			20	45%	
developed	11	68%		N/A	2	32%		N/A	21	48%	N
not discussed	0	0%			1	16%			0	0%	
other	0	0%			0	0%			3	7%	
no response	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%	
2. A rationale for the operation of a school system Job Placement Program has been written.				*							
yes	14	93%	7	58%	4	68%	1	12%	35	85%	6
no	1	7%	0	0%	1	16%	4	50%	6	15%	1
no response	0	0%	5	42%	1	16%	3	38%	0	0%	8
3. The rationale covers all aspects of a Job Placement Program.				**							
yes	15	100%	5	42%	4	68%	1	12%	27	66%	6
no	0	0%	3	25%	0	0%	1	12%	5	12%	0
no response	0	0%	4	33%	2	32%	6	76%	9	22%	9

* p $\leq$ .05
** p $\leq$ .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N=15 Target		N=12 Control		N=6 Target		N=3 Control		N=41 Target		N=15 Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. The rationale has been evaluated and validated.												**
yes	13	86%	6	50%	1	16%	1	12%	24	58%	6	40%
no	1	7%	1	8%	3	52%	1	12%	11	27%	0	0%
no response	1	7%	5	42%	2	32%	6	76%	6	15%	9	60%
5. Check the person(s) who validated the rationale.												
administrators	8	22%	6	30%	1	11%	0	0%	16	29%	5	42%
teachers	8	22%	6	30%	1	11%	0	0%	16	29%	5	42%
students	3	8%	1	5%	1	11%	0	0%	7	2%	2	16%
all of above	7	20%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	11	19%	0	0%
outside agency	8	22%	1	5%	1	11%	1	12%	6	11%	0	0%
no response	2	6%	4	20%	5	56%	7	88%	0	0%	0	0%
B. COMPONENTS OF A JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAM												
1. Descriptions of the various componerts of a Job Placement Program were _____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	8	47%			4	68%			20	47%		
developed	9	53%	N/A		2	32%	N/A		22	51%		
not discussed	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%	N/A	
other	0	0%			0	0%			1	2%		
no response	0	0%			0	0%			0	0%		

** p < .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. A description of the various components of a complete Job Placement Program has been developed.												
		**								*		
yes	13	87%	4	33%	2	32%	1	12%	32	78%	7	47%
no	2	13%	4	33%	4	68%	3	38%	6	15%	2	13%
no response	0	0%	4	34%	0	0%	4	50%	3	7%	6	40%
3. The descriptions were written by												
		**								**		
teachers	7	32%	6	33%	1	11%	0	0%	33	50%	6	35%
students	1	5%	2	11%	1	11%	0	0%	6	9%	1	6%
administrators	5	22%	4	23%	2	23%	0	0%	11	17%	2	12%
other	9	41%	0	0%	1	11%	1	12%	16	24%	2	12%
no response	0	0%	6	33%	4	44%	7	88%	0	0%	6	35%
4. A school or system Job Placement Program is important because												
incentive for students	8	9%	7	11%	5	10%	4	12%	34	12%	8	10%
assistance to students	11	12%	8	13%	6	12%	4	12%	38	15%	8	10%
communication between educators and employer	11	12%	8	13%	6	12%	4	12%	38	15%	8	10%
field training for students	10	11%	6	10%	3	5%	3	9%	32	11%	7	9%
disciplinary reasons	3	3%	2	3%	0	0%	2	6%	9	3%	4	5%
inadequate Job Placement services from other agencies	9	10%	3	5%	4	8%	2	6%	20	7%	5	7%
improve job placement process	8	8%	5	8%	6	12%	4	12%	32	11%	7	9%

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. Cont.												
provide trained workers for job needs in area	8	8%	6	10%	6	12%	4	12%	25	8%	7	9%
increase student self-discipline	8	8%	5	8%	4	8%	3	9%	21	7%	7	9%
recommended by federal agencies.	3	3%	2	3%	4	8%	0	0%	7	3#	6	8%
alternative to continued education	6	7%	2	3%	3	5%	2	6%	17	6%	7	9%
funded by federal or state agencies	5	5%	2	3%	4	8%	1	4%	6	2%	4	5%
other	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
no response	4	4%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
5. Components of a complete Job Placement Program have been developed for my school or district.										**		
none	2	13%	0	0%	1	16%	0	0%	3	7%	0	0%
some	7	47%	6	50%	1	16%	1	12%	8	44%	6	40%
all	2	13%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	10	47%	3	20%
no response	4	27%	4	33%	4	68%	7	88%	1	2%	6	40%
6. Components of a Job Placement Program existed in the school or district during the 1971-72 school year.										**		
none	N/A								10	23%	2	13%
some									29	71%	6	40%
all									1	3%	1	7%

*p ≤ .05
**p ≤ .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. Cont.												
no response									1	3%	6	40%
7. These components were successful.	N/A									*		
none									6	16%	1	7%
some									26	64%	5	33%
all									4	8%	1	7%
no response									5	12%	8	53%
C. IMPLEMENTING A JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAM												
1. The steps involved in implementing a Job Placement Program were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	4	25%										
developed	9	56%										
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A			
other	0	0%										
no response	3	19%										
2. The steps involved in implementing a complete Job Placement Program have been identified.							*				**	
yes	11	73%	7	59%	5	84%	1	12%	36	89%	9	60%
no	0	0%	0	0%	1	16%	2	24%	4	8%	0	0%
no response.	4	27%	5	41%	0	0%	5	64%	1	3%	6	4%
3. Components of a complete Job Placement Program have been implemented in my school or district.							*				**	
none	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	12%	4	10%	0	0%
some	9	60%	6	50%	5	100%	2	26%	25	61%	8	53%

* $\chi^2 .05$
** $\chi^2 .01$

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. Cont.												
all	1	6%	2	17%	0	0%	1	12%	11	27%	1	7%
no response	4	27%	4	33%	0	0%	4	50%	1	2%	6	40%
4. Plans have been developed to coordinate the activities of the various components.								*				**
yes	9	60%	8	67%	6	10%	2	24%	30	73%	7	47%
no	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	2	24%	8	20%	0	0%
no response	4	27%	4	33%	0	0%	4	52%	3	7%	8	53%
D. EVALUATION PROCEDURES												
1. Local evaluation procedures were _____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	5	33%										
developed	5	47%	N/A			N/A				N/A		
not discussed	0	0%										
other	0	0%										
no response	3	20%										
2. Evaluation procedures have been developed for the components of the Job Placement Program.												**
none	1	7%	0	0%	2	32%	1	12%	6	15%	0	0%
some	8	53%	5	42%	3	52%	2	24%	23	56%	6	40%
all	3	20%	4	33%	0	0%	0	0%	10	24%	2	13%
no response	3	20%	5	41%	1	16%	5	64%	2	5%	7	47%
3. Evaluation procedures have been implemented for components of the Job Placement Program.												**
none	3	21%	0	0%	2	32%	1	12%	9	22%	0	0%

*p ≤ .05
**p ≤ .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. Evaluation procedures have been implemented for components of the Job Placement Program.										**		
none	3	21%	0	0%	2	32%	1	12%	9	22%	0	0%
some	8	53%	5	42%	3	52%	2	24%	25	61%	8	53%
all	2	13%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	5	12%	0	0%
4. Based on the evaluation results, The Job Placement Program is ____ successful. /NR	2	13%	5	41%	1	16%	5	64%	2	5%	7	47%
										**		
not	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
somewhat	7	47%	5	42%	1	16%	1	12%	25	61%	5	33%
very	3	20%	2	16%	3	52%	1	12%	12	29%	3	20%
no response	4	26%	5	42%	2	32%	6	76%	2	5%	7	47%
E. REPORTING PROCEDURES												
1. Reporting procedures were _____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	5	33%										
developed	9	60%										
not discussed	0	0%	N/A			N/A				N/A		
other	0	0%										
no response	1	7%										
2. Reporting procedures have been planned.										**		
yes	12	80%	7	58%	3	50%	2	24%	30	74%	8	53%
no	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	12%	10	24%	0	0%
no response	1	7%	5	42%	3	50%	5	64%	1	2%	7	47%

*p < .05
**p < .01

/NR = Number of No Responses for item D_3

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. Reporting procedures are being implemented.												
yes	10	67%	6	50%	2	32%	2	24%	21	52% **	6	40%
no	3	20%	0	0%	1	16%	1	12%	19	46%	2	13%
no response	2	13%	6	50%	3	52%	5	64%	1	2%	7	47%
4. Reports are submitted to												
supervisor	6	19%	7	32%								
school administration	10	32%	6	27%								
local board	8	26%	2	9%						N/A		
Georgia Southern College.	3	10%	2	9%								
no response	4	13%	5	23%								
F. CONSULTANTS												
1. I had ____ contacts with career education consultants during the school year.										*		
zero	2	14%	3	25%	2	34%	1	12%	11	27%	1	7%
one	1	7%	1	8%	2	34%	2	26%	1	2%	0	0%
two	2	14%	1	8%	0	0%	1	12%	2	5%	1	7%
three	1	7%	0	0%	1	16%	0	0%	5	12%	2	13%
four	1	7%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	5	12%	2	13%
five	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
six	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%
more than six.	4	30%	1	8%	1	16%	0	0%	11	27%	1	7%
no response	1	7%	5	43%	0	0%	4	50%	2	5%	8	53%
2. Career education consultants visited my school to												
follow up on Summer Workshop practices	10	33%							16	33%		
respond to specific requests for assistance	8	27%							10	20%		

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Cont.												
generally review use of Summer												
Workshop activities	9	30%			N/A		N/A		N/A	9	17%	N/A
do not know	1	3%								9	17%	
other	0	0%								2	5%	
no response	2	7%								3	8%	
G. ROLE OF LOCAL, STATE, FEDERAL AGENCIES IN JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAMS												
1. Local agencies have been sought out to provide testing for students .											**	
Yes										16	39%	6	40%
no										22	54%	2	13%
no response										3	7%	7	47%
2. Local agencies have been sought out to provide job placement for students											**	
yes										34	83%	8	23%
no										5	12%	0	0%
no response										2	5%	7	47%
3. Local agencies are providing job placement for students.											**	
yes										30	73%	8	53%
no										8	20%	0	0%
no response										3	7%	7	47%

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. State, federal and local laws which affect school placement have been identified.										**		
yes									37	90%	8	53%
no									2	5%	0	0%
no response									2	5%	7	47%
5. State, federal and local laws and regulations were considered in developing the Job Placement Program.										**		
yes									36	88%	8	53%
no									2	5%	0	0%
no response									3	7%	7	47%
6. The needs and requirements of employers affect a Job Placement Program.										**		
yes									37	91%	8	53%
no									1	2%	0	0%
no response									3	7%	7	47%
7. Employers can assist job counselors and job placement personnel.										**		
yes									39	95%	8	53%
no									0	0%	0	0%
no response									2	5%	7	47%

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 5 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
8. Job counselors and placement personnel are more effective if they communicate with employers.												
yes									39	95%	8	53%
no									0	0%	0	0%
no response									2	5%	7	47%

**

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 6 - NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT E: PRE-VOCATIONAL (GSC & UG) AND DISADVANTAGED AND HANDICAPPED IN OFFICE OCCUPATIONS (GSU)

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N=7 Target		N=4 Control		N=10 Target		N=8 Control		N=83 Target		N=38 Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. CONCEPTS TO DEVELOP CAREER AWARENESS												
1. Concepts to be used to develop career awareness were _____ during the Summer Workshop												
presented	7	8%							53	59%		
developed	1	12%							35	38%		
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A				1	1%	N/A	
other	0	0%							1	1%		
no response	0	0%							1	1%		
2. Concepts to be used to develop career awareness have been identified or developed											**	
yes	7	100%	3	75%					81	98%	29	76%
no	0	0%	1	25%	N/A				2	2%	6	16%
no response	0	0%	0	0%					0	0%	3	8%
B. PROCEDURES FOR INTEGRATING CAREER AWARENESS AND WORLD OF CONSTRUCTION												
1. Procedures have been developed to integrate career awareness and world of construction concepts into the instructional program												
yes	7	100%	3	75%	N/A				79	96%	33	87%
no	0	0%	1	25%					2	2%	3	8%
no response	0	0%	0	0%					2	2%	2	5%
2. These procedures have been used in the classrooms											*	
yes	7	100%	2	50%					77	92%	29	76%
no	0	0%	1	25%					3	4%	6	16%
no response	0	0%	1	25%					3	4%	3	8%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
C. SELF AWARENESS ACTIVITIES												
1. Activities were ____ at the Summer Workshop to increase the student's understanding of himself by focusing on careers as they relate to the self.												
presented	4	44%							48	54%		
developed	4	44%							38	42%		
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A				2	2%	N/A	
other	0	0%							1	1%		
no response	1	12%							1	1%		
2. Activities have been developed to increase student understanding of himself by focusing on careers as they relate to the self.												
yes	6	86%	3	75%					73	89%	27	71%
no	0	0%	1	25%					6	7%	8	21%
no response	1	14%	0	0%					4	4%	3	8%
3. The activities have been used with students												
yes	7	100%	3	75%					73	89%	27	71%
no	0	0%	1	25%					2	2%	1	3%
no response	0	0%	0	0%					3	9%	10	26%
4. Student response to the activities was generally positive.											*	
yes	6	86%	2	50%					67	81%	23	60%
no	1	14%	0	0%					5	6%	3	8%
no response	0	0%	2	50%					11	13%	12	32%
5. Some of the activities grew out of the activities and ideas presented during the summer workshop.			*								**	
yes	7	100%	2	50%					72	87%	19	50%
no	0	0%	0	0%					2	2%	4	11%
no response	0	0%	2	50%					9	11%	15	29%

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. Self-awareness activities include :				*								
personality inventories	6	18%	2	26%					50	18%	12	15%
aptitude test	5	14%	1	12%					17	6%	7	9%
group seminars	4	12%	0	0%					27	10%	4	5%
interest inventories	4	12%	0	0%					48	17%	14	17%
role playing	7	22%	1	12%					69	24%	19	24%
small group activities	7	22%	1	12%					72	24%	21	26%
other	0	0%	1	12%					1	0%	2	2%
no response	0	0%	2	26%					1	1%	2	2%
D. PLANS FOR WORLD OF CONSTRUCTION												
1. Plans for instruction and training activities for the World of Construction were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	4	50%										
developed	4	50%										
not discussed	0	0%		N/A		N/A				N/A		
other	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
2. Plans of instruction and training activities for the World of Construction program have been developed.				**								
yes	7	100%	1	25%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								
no response	0	0%	3	75%								
3. The plans are in a sequential order.				**								
yes	7	100%	1	25%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								
no response	0	0%	3	75%								

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target		Control		Target	Control	Target	Control
	n	%	n	%	n %	n %	n %	n %
4. The plans agree with the content of the World of Construction program.				**				
yes	7	100%	1	25%				
no	0	0%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	3	75%				
5. The plans as developed provide adequate time for implementation.				*				
yes	5	72%	1	25%				
no	2	28%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	3	75%				
6. The plans have been used in classrooms.				**				
yes	7	100%	1	25%				
no	0	0%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	3	75%				
7. The plans have been revised as necessary.				*				
yes	6	86%	1	25%				
no	1	14%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	3	75%				
E. LEARNING EXPERIENCES FOR CAREER OPPORTUNITIES								
1. Learning experiences to broaden the student's understanding of various career opportunities were ____ at the Summer Workshop.								
presented	5	72%					42	49%
developed	2	28%					42	49%
not discussed	0	0%	N/A		N/A		1	1% N/A
other	0	0%					0	0%
no response	0	0%					1	1%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Learning experiences have been selected or developed to broaden the students understanding of various career opportunities.												
yes	6	86%	2	50%					76	92%	29	76%
no	0	0%	0	0%		N/A			2	2%	4	11%
no response	1	14%	2	50%					5	6%	5	13%
F. MATERIALS FOR WORLD OF CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM												
1. Materials and equipment have been ordered to support the World of Construction program.				**								
yes	6	86%	0	0%								
no	1	14%	0	0%		N/A				N/A		
no response	0	0%	4	100%								
2. Materials have been received				**								
yes	6	86%	0	0%								
no	0	0%	0	0%		N/A				N/A		
no response	1	14%	4	100%								
3. Materials have been used with students.				**								
yes	7	100%	0	0%								
no	0	0%	0	0%		N/A				N/A		
no response	0	0%	4	100%								

** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target		Control		Target	Control	Target	Control
	n	%	n	%	n %	n %	n %	n %
4. Provision has been made for revising the materials and learning experiences as needed. *								
yes	6	86%	1	25%				
no	1	14%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	3	75%				
5. The material and learning experiences need ___ revision. *								
little	2	25%	0	0%				
moderate	5	63%	1	25%	N/A		N/A	
great	1	12%	0	0%				
no response	0	0%	3	75%				
G. CURRICULUM INTEGRATION ACTIVITIES								
1. Activities to relate math, science and communication skills to the pre-vocational program were ___ at the Summer Workshop.								
presented	6	75%						
developed	2	25%						
not discussed	0	0%			N/A		N/A	
other	0	0%						
no response	0	0%						

* $p < .05$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Activities have been developed to relate math, science, and communication skills to the pre-vocational program.												
yes	7	100%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	1	25%		N/A				N/A		
no response	0	0%	1	25%								
3. The activities have been tried with students												
yes	7	100%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	1	25%		N/A				N/A		
no response	0	0%	1	25%								
4. Provision has been made to revise the activities.												
yes	6	86%	2	50%								
no	1	14%	1	25%		N/A				N/A		
no response	0	0%	1	25%								
5. The activities need ___ revision												
little	2	25%	0	0%								
moderate	5	63%	2	50%		N/A				N/A		
great	1	12%	0	0%								
no response	0	0%	2	50%								

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target		Control		Target	Control	Target	Control
	n	%	n	%	n %	n %	n %	n %
H. IDENTIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL LEVELS								
1. Procedures for identifying the education levels necessary for entry into specific construction industries were ___ at the Summer Workshop.								
presented.	4	57%						
developed.	3	43%						
not discussed.	0	0%	N/A		N/A		N/A	
other	0	0%						
no response.	0	0%						
2. Education levels necessary for entry into specific construction industries have been identified.				*				
yes.	7	100%	2	50%				
no	0	0%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response.	0	0%	2	50%				
3. These entry level educational requirements have been presented to students.				*				
yes.	7	100%	2	50%				
no	0	0%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response.	0	0%	2	50%				

* $p < .05$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target		Control		Target	Control	Target	Control
	n	%	n	%	n %	n %	n %	n %
4. Student behavior indicates that students find this information helpful.								
yes	6	86%	2	50%				
no	1	14%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	2	50%				
I. PROCEDURES FOR ACQUAINTING OTHER EDUCATORS IN THE WORLD OF CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.								
1. Plans have been developed to make other educators aware of the World of Construction program.								
yes	6	86%	2	50%				
no	1	14%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	2	50%				
2. These plans or procedures have been carried out.								
yes	6	86%	2	50%				
no	1	14%	0	0%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	2	50%				
3. Other teachers indicated an interest in the World of Construction program as a result of the procedures for acquainting them with the program.				*				
yes	5	72%	0	0%				
no	2	28%	4	100%	N/A		N/A	
no response	0	0%	0	0%				

* $p < .05$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
J. CONSULTANTS												
1. I had ___ contacts with career education consultants during the school year.						**				*		
zero	3	35%	2	50%	1	9%	1	11%	31	38%	14	37%
one	3	35%	0	0%	5	45%	0	0%	15	18%	4	11%
two	1	10%	0	0%	3	28%	0	0%	9	11%	3	8%
three	1	10%	2	50%	0	0%	1	11%	7	8%	1	3%
four	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	9	11%	1	3%
five	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	6%	3	8%
six	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3	8%
more than six	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	4	5%	2	4%
no response	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	7	78%	2	2%	7	18%
2. Career education consultants visted my school to												
follow up on Summer Workshop activities	3	38%			2	20%			30	35%		
respond to specific request for asst.	0	0%			1	10%			19	21%		
generally review use of Summer Workshop activities	1	12%	N/A		0	0%	N/A		23	26%	N/A	
do not know	2	25%			5	50%			9	10%		
other	0	0%			2	20%			4	4%		
no response	2	25%			0	0%			4	4%		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
K. PRE-VOCATIONAL MINI-COURSES												
1. Possible considerations for pre-vocational mini-courses were ___ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented									52	62%		
developed									31	36%		
not discussed		N/A				N/A			0	0%		N/A
other									0	0%		
no response									2	2%		
2. Pre-vocational mini-courses have been developed.										**		
yes									67	81%	13	34%
no		N/A				N/A			9	11%	17	45%
no response									7	8%	8	21%
3. The pre-vocational mini-courses have been used in classrooms.										**		
yes									65	78%	12	32%
no		N/A				N/A			3	4%	7	18%
no response									15	18%	19	50%
4. The procedures and activities interest and involve students.										**		
yes									67	81%	12	32%
no		N/A				N/A			3	4%	4	11%
no response									13	15%	22	57%

** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5. Procedures have been developed to revise the mini-courses.										**		
yes									45	54%	7	18%
no									22	27%	7	18%
no response									16	19%	24	64%
6. The mini-courses need ___ revision										**		
little									12	14%	4	11%
moderate									47	57%	7	18%
great									9	11%	0	0%
no response									15	18%	27	71%
7. Some of the mini-courses used were presented or developed at the Summer Workshop.												
yes									65	78%	11	29%
no									3	4%	3	8%
no response									15	18%	24	63%
8. Those mini-courses were suitable for the students in my district or school.										**		
yes									56	68%	8	21%
no									12	14%	3	8%
no response									15	18%	27	71%
L. MATERIALS FOR LEARNING EXPERIENCES												
1. Materials selected or developed cover a variety of career occupations.												
yes									73	88%	31	82%
no									4	5%	4	11%
no response									6	7%	3	8%

** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Materials and learning experiences have been used with students.												
yes									73	88%	30	80%
no									6	7%	4	11%
no response									4	5%	4	11%
3. Provision has been made for revising the materials and learning experiences as needed.										*		
yes									62	75	21	55%
no									15	18%	8	21%
no response									6	7%	9	24%
4. The materials and learning experiences need ___ revision.												**
little									15	18%	10	26%
moderate									60	72%	11	29%
great									4	5%	4	11%
no response									4	5%	13	34%
M. TEAM ACTIVITIES												
1. Procedures for team work were ___ during the summer workshop.												
presented									55	65%		
developed									25	29%		
not discussed									3	4%		N/A
other									1	1%		
no response									1	1%		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. A team of teachers has been formed to relate math, science, and communication skills to the pre-vocational program.										**		
yes									38	46%	19	50%
no									45	54%	12	32%
no response									0	0%	7	18%
3. The team has developed procedures and guidelines.										*		
yes									32	39%	18	48%
no									47	56%	13	34%
no response									4	5%	7	18%
4. The team has worked in classrooms with students.										*		
yes									32	39%	14	37%
no									46	55%	16	42%
no response									5	6%	8	21%
5. The team has provided assistance to other teachers in interrelating the academic and pre-vocational aspects of the instructional program.												
yes									28	34%	17	45%
no									49	59%	14	37%
no response									6	7%	7	18%
6. Provision has been made to revise the work done by the team.												
yes									29	35%	14	37%
no									43	52%	14	37%
no response									11	13%	10	26%

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
7. The procedures and activities developed by the team need _____ revision												
little									10	12%	11	29%
moderate									26	31%	3	8%
great									15	18%	5	13%
no response									32	39%	19	50%
II. UNDERSTANDING OF CAREER EDUCATION												
1. Career education in elementary school is an important preparation for vocational choice												
agree					10	100%	7	88%				
disagree					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					0	0%	1	12%				
2. Visits to industries and businesses give insight into the world of work.												
agree					10	100%	7	88%				
disagree					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					0	0%	1	12%				
3. Interviewing workers provides knowledge of job requirements and job satisfactions which the teacher can communicate to students.												
agree					10	100%	7	88%				
disagree					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					0	0%	1	12%				

** $p < .01$

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. The fundamental concept of career education is that all types of educational experiences, curriculum, instruction, and counseling should involve preparation for:								*				
ecomomic independence					5	28%	1	12%				
Personal fulfillment					7	39%	2	25%				
appreciation for the dignity of work					6	33%	1	12%				
none of the above					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					0	0%	4	51%				
5. Career education is concerned with:								*				
Preserving what is good in career preparation					2	15%	1	12%				
giving new structure to the curriculum					2	15%	1	12%				
correlating the subject matter content with world of work.					9	70%	2	25%				
none of the above					0	0%	0	0%				
no responses					0	0%	4	51%				
0. CAREER ORIENTED ACTIVITIES												
1. Career oriented activities were ___ in the Summer Workshop.												
presented					4	36%						
developed					7	64%	N/A					
not discussed					0	0%						
other					0	0%						
no response					0	0%						

*p < .05

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Contro
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
2. I have developed ___ career oriented activities											
0					0	0%	0	0%			
1					1	10%	0	0%			
2					0	0%	0	0%			
3					2	20%	2	25%			
4					2	20%	0	0%			
5					1	10%	0	0%			
6					2	20%	1	12%			
more than 6					1	10%	1	12%			
no response					1	10%	4	51%			
3. These activities were suited for my grade level.											
yes					9	90%	5	63%			
no					1	10%	0	0%			
no response					0	0%	3	37%			
4. The degree of student interest in these activities was:											
none					0	0%	0	0%			
little					1	9%	0	0%			
average					3	27%	2	25%			
much					4	37%	0	0%			
great					2	18%	2	25%			
no response					1	9%	4	50%			
5. These career oriented activities seemed to have met most of the individual needs of students.											
yes					8	80%	3	38%			
no					1	10%	1	12%			
no response					1	10%	4	50%			

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. These activities are:												
fine as written					1	10%	1	12%				
need some revision					8	80%	4	50%				
should be completely revised					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					1	10%	3	38%				
P. PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING A GUIDE AND UNITS PRODUCED												
1. Procedures for developing a guide for career oriented activities was ____ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented					7	58%						
developed					4	34%	N/A					
not discussed					0	0%						
other					0	0%						
no response					1	8%						
2. A guide for career oriented activities has been developed for my school.												
yes					1	10%						
no					5	50%	N/A					
no response					4	40%						
3. A guide was completed for career oriented activities in which I had:												
little input					1	10%	2	25%				
moderate input					0	0%	1	12%				
great input					0	0%	1	12%				
no response					9	90%	4	51%				
4. The finished guide offered:												
more than 10 units					0	0%	1	12%				
about 15 units					0	0%	1	12%				

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	Georgia Southern College				Georgia State University				University of Georgia			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. Cont.												
about 10 units					1	10%	0	0%				
less than 10 units					1	10%	0	0%				
no response					9	90%	6	76%				
5. The units developed and integrate career activities with the established curriculum.												
yes					1	10%	3	38%				
no					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					9	90%	5	62%				
6. A plan has been developed for implementing the units.												
yes					1	10%	1	12%				
no					0	0%	1	12%				
no response					9	90%	6	76%				
7. The plan is flexible of specialization.												
yes					2	20%	3	38%				
no					0	0%	0	0%				
no response					8	80%	5	62%				
8. A plan for implementing the units has been used this year.								*				
yes					1	10%	1	12%				
no					1	10%	1	12%				
no response					8	80%	6	76%				

*p < .05

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
9. The preparation of career education units was ____ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented					3	27%						
developed					8	73%						
not discussed					0	0%	N/A					
other					0	0%						
no response					0	0%						
10. I helped prepare ___ career education units							*					
0					1	10%	2	25%				
1					0	0%	0	0%				
2					0	0%	0	0%				
3					0	0%	0	0%				
4					2	20%	0	0%				
5					1	10%	0	0%				
6					3	30%	0	0%				
more than 6					3	30%	0	0%				
no response					0	0%	6	75%				
11. Experience in such activities has been useful to me in other instructional areas.							*					
yes					9	90%	2	25%				
no					0	0%	1	12%				
no response					1	10%	5	63%				

*p < .05

TABLE 6 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
D. TEAM ACTIVITIES												
1. In-service planning activities are a valuable experience.												
yes					9	90%						
no					1	10%	N/A					
no response					0	0%						
2. Procedures for in-service team planning activities were ____ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented					4	40%						
developed					2	20%						
not discussed					4	40%	N/A					
other					0	0%						
no response					0	0%						
3. Working as a team is a more productive method of accomplishing goals than working alone.							*					
agree					10	100%	3	38%				
disagree					0	0%	1	12%				
no response					0	0%	4	50%				

*p < .05

TABLE 7 - NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT F: WORLD OF CONSTRUCTION

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		N=12 Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. LOCAL CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY												
1. Procedures for integrating the career education program with the local construction industry were ____ during the Summer Workshop.											N/A	
2. The local construction industry was consulted in developing the career education program.												
yes											9	75%
no											2	17%
no response											1	8%
3. The occupations available in the local construction industry have been reviewed.												
yes											11	92%
no											0	0%
no response											1	8%
4. Information concerning occupations in the local construction industry is available to students.												
yes											11	92%
no											0	0%
no response											1	8%
5. Information on requirements for these occupations has been collected.												
yes											10	83%
no											2	17%
no response											0	0%

(NO TARGET GROUP DATA DUE TO LACK OF PARTICIPANT MAILING LIST)

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. Information on occupational requirements is available to students.												
yes											12	100%
no											0	0%
no response											0	0%
7. Time and assistance are provided to students in using occupational information.												
yes											10	84%
no											1	8%
no response											1	8%
8. Students make use of information on occupational requirements.												
yes											9	75%
no											2	17%
no response											1	8%
B. PROCEDURES FOR RELATING CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY TO INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY												
1. Procedures for relating construction technology to industrial technology were ___ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented												
developed												
not discussed												
other												
no response												

158

159

N/A

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Procedures have been developed to make clear to students the relationship of construction technology to industrial technology.												
yes											4	33%
no											6	50%
no response											2	17%
3. I had ___ input into the development of the procedures for interrelating construction and industrial technology.												
little											4	33%
moderate											3	25%
great											1	9%
4. The procedures have been used in classrooms.												
yes											6	50%
no											1	8%
no response											5	42%
5. The procedures need ___ revision												
little											1	8%
moderate											4	33%
great											2	17%
no response											5	42%
6. Guidelines or procedures have been developed to revise and update the information concerning industrial technology.												
yes											5	42%
no											2	16%
no response											5	42%

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %
C. PROCEDURES FOR RELATING CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY TO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT						
1. Procedures for relating construction technology to community development were ___ during the Summer Workshop.						
presented						
developed						N/A
not discussed						
other						
no response						
2. Procedures have been developed for assisting students to consider the relationship between construction technology and community development.						
yes						7 58%
no						3 25%
no response						2 17%
3. I had ___ input into the development of procedures for relating construction technology and community development.						
little						5 42%
moderate						4 33%
great						2 17%
no response						1 8%
4. The procedures have been used in the classroom.						
yes						7 58%
no						3 25%
no response						2 17%

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5. Guidelines or procedures have been developed to revise and update this component of the instructional program.												
yes											7	58%
no											3	25%
no response											2	17%
6. The component needs ____ revision												
little											2	17%
moderate											7	58%
great											1	8%
no response											2	17%
7. Activities have been developed to encourage student involvement.												
yes											12	100%
no											0	0%
no response											0	0%
8. Student response to the activities was generally positive and indicated interest.												
yes											11	92%
no											1	8%
no response											0	0%
9. The activities have resulted in greater involvement in their instructional program.												
yes											11	92%
no											1	8%
no response											0	0%

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10. Some of the activities grew out of activities and ideas presented during the Summer Workshop.												
yes												
no												
no response												N/A
D. PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING A COURSE OUTLINE												
1. Procedures for developing a course outline were ___ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented												
developed												N/A
not discussed												
other												
no response												
2. An outline of the course, or a plan of course content, has been developed.												
yes											5	42%
no											6	50%
no response											1	8%
3. The outline provides a clear picture of the steps or levels through which students move.												
yes											6	50%
no											1	8%
no response											5	42%

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
4. The outline has been used in developing instructional plans.												
yes											7	58%
no											1	8%
no response											4	34%
5. The outline or plan needs ____ revision.												
little											1	8%
moderate											6	50%
great											0	0%
E. CONSULTANTS (D-5)/no response											5	42%
1. I have had ____ contacts with career education consultants during the school year.												
0											2	15%
1											2	15%
2											4	31%
3											1	8%
4											2	15%
5											1	8%
6											1	8%
more than 6											0	0%
no response											0	0%
visited												
nop activities												
respond to specific requests												
generally review Summer Workshop activities												

TABLE 7 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Career education consultants visited my school to:												
follow up on Summer Workshop activities												
respond to specific requests for assistance												N/A
generally review Summer Workshop activities												
do not know												
other												

TABLE 8 - NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT G: WORLD OF MANUFACTURING

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N= 5		N=4						N=6		N=12	
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. CAREER AWARENESS CONCEPTS												
1. Concepts to be used to develop career awareness were ___ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	1	17%	0	0%								
developed	2	32%	2	50%								
not discussed	1	17%	0	0%							N/A	
other	1	17%	0	0%								
no response	1	17%	2	50%								
2. Concepts to be used to develop career awareness have been identified or developed.												
yes	4	80%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%							N/A	
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
B. PROCEDURES TO INTEGRATE CAREER AWARENESS AND WORLD OF WORK CONCEPTS												
1. Procedures to integrate careet awareness and world of work concepts into the instructional program were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	2	40%										
developed	2	40%										
not discussed	0	0%	N/A								N/A	
other	0	0%										
no response	1	20%										

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Procedures have been developed to integrate career awareness and world of work concepts into tne instructional program.												
yes	4	80%	1	25%								
no	0	0%	1	25%						N/A		
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
3. These procedures have been used in the classrooms.												
yes	4	80%	1	25%								
no	0	0%	1	25%						N/A		
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
4. Procedures for integrating the career education program with the local manufacturing industry were ___ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented									4	68%		
developed									0	0%		
not discussed		N/A							0	0%		N/A
other									0	0%		
no response									2	32%		

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
C. SELF-AWARENESS ACTIVITIES												
1. Activities to increase student understanding of himself by focusing on careers as they relate to the self were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	2	40%	0	0%								
developed	0	0%	2	50%								
not discussed	1	20%	0	0%								N/A
other	1	20%	0	0%								
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
2. Activities have been developed to increase student understanding of himself by focusing on careers as they relate to the self.												
yes	4	80%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								N/A
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
3. The activities have been used with students.												
yes	4	80%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								N/A
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
4. Student response to the activities was generally positive.												
yes	2	40%	2	50%								
no	1	20%	0	0%								N/A
no response	2	40%	2	50%								

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5. Some of the activities grew out of the activities and ideas presented during the summer workshop.												
yes	4	80%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								N/A
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
6. Self awareness activities include:												
personality inventories	0	0%	2	20%								
aptitude tests	1	9%	1	10%								
group seminars	0	0%	1	10%								
interest inventories	2	19%	1	10%								N/A
role playing	3	27%	2	20%								
small group activities	3	27%	1	10%								
other	1	9%	0	0%								
no response	1	9%	2	20%								
D. PLANS FOR THE WORLD OF MANUFACTURING PROGRAM												
1. Plans for instruction and training activities for the World of Manufacturing program were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	0	0%										
developed	2	40%										
not discussed	0	0%		N/A								N/A
other	1	20%										
no response	2	40%										

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Plans of instruction and training activities for the World of Manufacturing program have been developed.												
yes	2	40%	2	50%								
no	1	20%	0	0%								N/A
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
3. The plans are in a sequential order												
yes	2	40%	2	50%								
no	1	20%	0	0%								N/A
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
4. The plans agree with the content of the World of Manufacturing program.												
yes	2	40%	2	50%								
no	1	20%	0	0%								N/A
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
5. The plans as developed provide adequate time for implementation.												
yes	2	40%	2	50%								
no	1	20%	0	0%								N/A
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
6. The plans have been used in classrooms.												
yes	3	60%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								N/A
no response	2	40%	2	50%								

Item omitted, see last pg of Table

** p < .01

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
E. LEARNING EXPERIENCES AND MATERIALS FOR CAREER OCCUPATIONS												
1. Learning experiences to broaden the student's understanding of various career occupations were ____ at the Summer Workshop.				**								
presented	3	60%	1	25%								
developed	0	0%	1	25%								
not discussed	0	0%	0	0%							N/A	
other	0	0%	0	0%								
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
2. Learning experiences have been selected or developed to broaden the student's understanding of various career occupations.												
yes	3	60%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%							N/A	
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
3. Materials selected or developed cover a variety of career occupations.												
yes	3	60%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%							N/A	
no response	2	40%	2	50%								
4. Materials and learning experiences have been used with students.												
yes	2	40%	2	50%								
no	1	20%	0	0%							N/A	
no response	2	40%	2	50%								

** $p < .01$

181 A

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target		Control		Target	Control	Target	Control
	n	%	n	%	n %	n %	n %	n %
5. Provision has been made for revising the materials and learning experiences as needed.								
yes	3	60%	2	50%				
no	1	20%	0	0%				N/A
no response	1	20%	2	50%				
6. The materials and learning experiences need _____ revision.								
little	1	20%	1	25%				
moderate	3	60%	1	25%				N/A
great	0	0%	0	0%				
no response	1	20%	2	50%				
F. TEAM ACTIVITIES								
1. Procedures for teams of teachers to relate math, science and communication skills to the pre-vocational program were ___ at the Summer Workshop.								
presented	3	60%						
developed	2	40%	N/A					N/A
not discussed	0	0%						
other	0	0%						
no response	0	0%						
2. A team of teachers has been formed to relate math, science, and communication skills to the pre-vocational program.								
yes	1	20%	0	0%				
no	3	60%	2	50%				N/A
no response	1	20%	2	50%				

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. The team has developed procedures and guidelines.												
yes	1	20%	0	0%								
no	3	60%	2	50%							N/A	
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
4. The team has worked in classrooms with students.												
yes	1	20%	0	0%								
no	3	60%	2	50%							N/A	
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
5. The team has provided assistance to other teachers in interrelating the academic and pre-vocational aspects of the instructional program.												
yes	1	20%	0	0%								
no	3	60%	2	50%							N/A	
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
6. Provision has been made to revise the work done by the team.												
yes	0	0%	0	0%								
no	4	80%	2	50%							N/A	
no response	1	20%	2	50%								
7. The procedures and activities developed by the team need ____ revision.												
little	0	0%	0	0%								
moderate	1	20%	0	0%								
great	1	20%	1	25%							N/A	
no response	3	60%	3	75%								

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
G. CONSULTANTS												
1. I had ___ contacts with career education consultants during the school year.												
0	2	40%	0	0%					1	16%	4	34%
1	0	0%	1	25%					1	16%	1	8%
2	0	0%	0	0%					1	16%	1	8%
3	1	20%	1	25%					1	16%	1	8%
4	0	0%	0	0%					2	36%	1	8%
5	1	20%	0	0%					0	0%	0	0%
6	0	0%	0	0%					0	0%	0	0%
more than 6	0	0%	0	0%					0	0%	2	17%
no response	1	20%	2	50%					0	0%	2	17%
2. Career education consultants visited my school to:												
follow up on Summer Workshop activities	1	11%							3	35%		
response to specific requests for assistance	2	26%							1	10%		
general review of use of Workshop activities	1	11%		N/A					3	35%		N/A
do not know	0	0%							1	10%		
other	2	26%							1	10%		
no response	2	26%							0	0%		
H. LOCAL MANUFACTURING PROGRAM INFORMATION												
1. The local manufacturing programs were consulted in developing the career education program.												
yes									4	68%	8	67%
no		N/A							1	16%	3	35%
no response									1	16%	1	8%

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %
7. Time and assistance are provided to students in using occupational information.						
yes.					5 84%	9 76%
no	N/A				0 0%	0 0%
no response					1 16%	3 24%
8. Students make use of information on occupational requirements.						
yes.					4 68%	9 76%
no	N/A				1 16%	1 8%
no response					1 16%	2 16%
I. PROCEDURES TO RELATE MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY TO INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY						
1. Procedures for relating manufacturing technology to industrial technology were ____ during the Summer Workshop.						
presented					2 32%	
developed					2 32%	
not discussed	N/A				1 18%	N/A
other					0 0%	
no response					1 18%	
2. Procedures have been developed to make clear to students the relationship of manufacturing technology to industrial technology.						
yes					4 68%	6 50%
no					0 0%	3 25%
no response					2 32%	3 25%

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	Georgia Southern College				Georgia State University				University of Georgia			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. I had ___ input into the development of the procedures for interrelating manufacturing and industrial technology.												
little									1	16%	3	25%
moderate		N/A							1	16%	2	17%
great									3	52%	1	8%
no response									1	16%	6	25%
4. The procedures have been used in classrooms												
yes									4	68%	7	58%
no		N/A							1	16%	0	0%
no response									1	16%	5	42%
5. The procedures need ____ revision.												
little									3	52%	1	8%
moderate		N/A							1	16%	6	50%
great									1	16%	0	0%
no response									1	16%	5	42%
6. Guidelines or procedures have been developed to revise and update the information concerning manufacturing technology.												
yes									4	68%	7	58%
no		N/A							1	16%	0	0%
no response									1	16%	5	42%

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
J. PROCEDURES TO RELATE MANAGEMENT, PERSONNEL AND PRODUCTION PRACTICES.												
1. Procedures for relating management, personnel, and production practices were ____ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented									2	32%		
developed									3	52%		
not discussed		N/A							0	0%	N/A	
other									0	0%		
no responses									1	16%		
2. The interrelationships between management, personnel and production practices have been identified.												
yes									4	68%	7	58%
no		N/A							1	16%	1	9%
no response									1	16%	4	33%
3. Activities are provided within the instructional program to assist students in understanding the interrelationships between management, personnel and production practices.												
yes									4	68%	7	58%
no		N/A							0	0%	0	0%
no response									2	32%	5	42%
K. ACTIVITIES FOR STUDENT INVOLVEMENT												
1. Activities have been developed to encourage student involvement.												
yes									4	68%	8	67%
no		N/A							0	0%	0	0%
no response									2	32%	4	33%

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2. Student response to the activities was generally positive and indicated interest.												
yes									4	68%	8	67%
no		N/A							0	0%	0	0%
no response									2	32%	4	33%
3. The activities have resulted in greater student involvement in their instructional program.												
yes									4	68%	7	58%
no		N/A							0	0%	0	0%
no resporse									2	32%	5	42%
4. Some of the activities grew out of activities and ideas presented during the Summer Workshop.												
yes									4	68%		
no		N/A							0	0%	N/A	
no resporse									2	32%		
L. COURSE OUTLINE												
1. Procedures for developing a course outline were ____ during the Summer Workshop.												
presented									3	52%		
developed									2	32%		
not discussed		N/A							0	0%	N/A	
other									0	0%		
no response									1	16%		
2. An outline of the course, or a plan of course intent, has been developed.												
yes									5	84%	7	58%
no		N/A							0	0%	3	25%
no response									1	16%	2	17%

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. The outline provides a clear picture of the steps or levels through which students move.												
yes									4	68%	3	25%
no	N/A								1	16%	3	25%
no response									1	16%	6	50%
4. The outline has been used in developing instructional plans.												
yes									5	84%	5	42%
no	N/A								0	0%	1	8%
no response									1	16%	6	50%
5. The outline or plan needs ____ revision.												
little									3	52%	2	16%
moderate									1	16%	4	34%
great									1	16%	1	8%
no response									1	16%	5	42%
# 7. The plans have been revised as necessary.				**								
yes	3	60%	2	50%								
no	0	0%	0	0%								
no response	2	40%	2	50%								

** $p < .01$

TABLE 9 - NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES FOR COMPONENT H: TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL CLUSTER

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	N=4											
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
A. CAREER AWARENESS												
1. Concepts to be used to develop career awareness were _____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	4	100%										
developed	0	0%										
not discussed	0	0%										
other	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
2. Concepts to be used to develop career awareness have been identified or developed.												
yes	4	100%										
no	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
B. INTEGRATING CAREER AWARENESS AND WORLD OF WORK												
1. Procedures have been developed to integrate career awareness and world of work concepts into the instructional program.												
yes	4	100%										
no	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
2. These procedures have been used in the classrooms.												
yes	4	100%										
no	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										

*p ≤ .05
**p ≤ .01

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
C. SELF-AWARENESS ACTIVITIES												
1. Activities to increase the students understanding of himself by focusing on careers as they relate to the self were at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	4	100%										
developed	0	0%										
not discussed	0	0%										
other	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
2. Activities have been developed to increase student understanding of himself by focusing on careers as they relate to the self.												
yes	4	100%										
no	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
3. The activities have been used with students.												
yes	4	100%										
no	0	0%										
no responses	0	0%										
4.												

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %
4. Student response to the activities was generally positive.						
yes	4 100%					
no	0 0%					
no response	0 0%					
5. Some of the activities grew out of the activities and ideas presented during the Summer Workshop.						
yes	4 100%					
no	0 0%					
no response	0 0%					
6. Self awareness activities include						
personality inventories	0 0%					
aptitude test	0 0%					
group seminars	3 33%					
interest inventories	1 11%					
role playing	2 23%					
small group activities	3 33%					
other	0 0%					
no responses	0 0%					
D. COURSES OF STUDY FOR THE MULTI-OCCUPATIONAL CONCEPT						
1. Courses of study for the multi-occupational or cluster concept of occupational orientation at the secondary level were _____ at the Summer Workshop						

*p < .05
**p < .01

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Cont.												
presented	2	40%										
developed	3	60%										
not discussed	0	0%										
other	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
2. A course of study has been developed for the multi-occupational or cluster concept of occupational orientation at the secondary school level												
yes	2	50%										
no	2	50%										
no response	0	0%										
3. I had ____ input into the development of the course of study.												
little	0	0%										
moderate	3	75%										
Great	1	25%										
4. The course of study follows a sequential order.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										
5. The course of study includes a realistic provision of time for instructional activities.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. Procedures have been developed to revise the course of study.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										
7. The course of study needs _____ revision.												
little	0	0%										
moderate	3	75%										
great	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										
E. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS												
1. Instructional plans to meet the individual needs of students with different capabilities were ___ at at the Summer Workshop.												
presented	3	75%										
developed	1	25%										
not discussed	0	0%										
other	0	0%										
no response	0	0%										
2. Instructional plans have been developed to meet the individual needs of students with different capabilities.												
yes	3	75%										
no	1	25%										
no response	0	0%										

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
3. Instructional plans have been used in the classrooms.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response.	1	25%										
4. Procedures have been developed to determine the success or failure of the instructional plans.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response.	1	25%										
5. Procedures have been developed to revise the instructional plans.												
yes	2	50%										
no	1	25%										
no response.	1	25%										
6. The instructional plans need ____ revision.												
little	0	0%										
moderate	3	75%										
great	0	0%										
no response.	1	25%										
F. LEARNING EXPERIENCES AND MATERIALS FOR CAREER OCCUPATIONS												
1. Learning experiences to broaden the student's understanding of various career occupations were____ at the Summer Workshop.												

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
E. Cont.												
presented	3	75%										
developed	0	0%										
not discussed	0	0%										
other	1	25%										
no response	0	0%										
2. Learning experiences have been selected or developed to broaden the student's understanding of various career occupations.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										
3. Materials selected or developed cover a variety of career occupations.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										
4. Materials and learning experiences have been used with students.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										
5. Provision has been made for revising the materials and learning experiences as needed.												
yes	3	75%										
no	0	0%										
no response	1	25%										

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
6. The materials and learning experiences need _____ revision												
little	1	25%										
moderate	2	50%										
great	0	0%										
no resporse	1	25%										
G. CONSULTANTS												
1. I had ____ contacts with career education consultants during the school year.												
0	0	0%							10	21%		
1	1	25%							9	19%		
2	0	0%							10	21%		
3	1	25%							8	18%		
4	1	25%							0	0%		
5	0	0%							0	0%		
6	0	0%							2	4%		
more than 6	0	0%							1	2%		
no response	1	25%							7	15%		
2. Career education consultants visited my school to:												
follow up Summer Workshop activities	1	17%										
respond to specific requests. .	1	17%										
generally review the use of Workshop activities.	2	32%										
do not know	1	17%										
other	0	0%										
no response	1	17%										

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
H. LEARNING EVALUATION LABS IN POST-SECONDARY TECHNICAL SCHOOL												
1. learning evaluation labs serve a purpose in a post-secondary technical school.												
agree									48	91%		
disagree									0	0%		
no response.									4	9%		
2. The rationale for operating learning evaluation labs in post-secondary technical schools was ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented									33	70%		
developed									8	17%		
not discussed.									0	0%		
other									0	0%		
no response.									6	13%		
3. A learning evaluation lab is in operation in the post-secondary technical school where I teach.												
yes									42	89%		
no									1	2%		
no response.									4	9%		
As a result of the Summer Workshop.												
yes									10	21%		
no									32	68%		
no response.									5	11%		
I. RECRUITMENT PROCEDURES												
1. Procedures for recruiting students for the learning evaluation labs were												

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Cont. _____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented									30	64%		
developed									14	30%		
not discussed.									1	2%		
other									0	0%		
no response									2	4%		
2. Recruitment procedures have been developed for a learning evaluation lab for my school.												
yes									43	91%		
no									1	2%		
no response									3	5%		
As a result of the Summer Workshop.												
yes									9	19%		
no									33	70%		
no response									6	11%		
3. Other agencies can be helpful in the recruiting process.												
yes									44	94%		
no									0	0%		
no response									3	6%		
4. Students have been recruited for the learning evaluation lab in my school.												
yes									43	92%		
no									1	2%		
no response									3	6%		
J. WORK SAMPLES												

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Cont.												
other									1	2%		
no response									6	13%		
2. Systematic observation procedures have been established for my school.												
yes									38	81%		
no									5	11%		
no response									4	5%		
As a result of the Summer Workshop.												
yes									21	45%		
no									24	51%		
no response									8	4%		
3. Systematic observation procedures have been used to observe students in the learning evaluation lab in my school.												
yes									40	85%		
no									3	6%		
no response									4	9%		
L. TEAM ACTIVITIES												
1. Team planning activities are a valuable experience.												
yes									42	89%		
no									0	0%		
no response									5	11%		
2. Working as a team is a more productive method of accomplishing goals												

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE				GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY				UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA			
	Target		Control		Target		Control		Target		Control	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
L. Procedures for setting up work samples were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented									30	61%		
developed									17	35%		
not discussed									1	2%		
other									1	2%		
no response									0	0%		
2. Procedures for setting up work samples have been established for my school.												
yes									301	64%		
no									17	36%		
no response									0	0%		
As a result of the Summer Workshop.												
yes									23	49%		
no									18	38%		
no response									6	13%		
3. Work samples have been set up for the learning evaluation lab in my school.												
yes									39	83%		
no									3	6%		
no response									5	11%		
K. SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION PROCEDURES												
1. Procedures for conducting systematic observations of trainees were ____ at the Summer Workshop.												
presented									28	60%		
developed									11	23%		
not discussed									1	2%		

TAPLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GOERGIA	
	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %	Target n %	Control n %
2. Cont. than working alone.						
yes					42 89%	
no					2 4%	
no response					3 7%	
3. The functions of a team within the learning evaluation lab were ____ at the Summer Workshop.						
presented					31 66%	
developed					7 15%	
not discussed					2 4%	
other					3 6%	
no response					4 9%	
4. I have worked as part of a team during the past school year.						
yes					41 87%	
no					3 6%	
no response					3 7%	
M. RATIONALE FOR JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAM						
1. The rationale for a job placement program was ____ at the Summer Workshop.						
presented					34 72%	
developed					7 15%	
not discussed					4 9%	
other					2 4%	
no response					0 0%	
2. A rationale has been developed for the operation of a job placement program as part of the learning evaluation lab with my school.						

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target	Control	Target	Control	Target	Control
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
2. Cont.						
yes					41 87%	
no					3 6%	
no response.					3 7%	
As a result of the Summer Workshop.						
yes					15 32%	
no					26 53%	
no response.					7 15%	
3. The rationale covers all aspects of a job placement program.						
yes					30 64%	
no					13 28%	
no response.					4 8%	
II. JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAM						
1. A description of the various components of a complete job placement system has been developed.						
yes					21 45%	
no					20 43%	
no resporse.					6 12%	
2. Procedures have been developed for implementirg a job placement program within the learning evaluation lab in my school.						
yes					37 78%	
no					5 11%	
no response.					5 11%	
As a result of the Summer Workshop.						
yes					11 23%	

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	
	Target	Control	Target	Control	Target	Control
	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
@. Cont.						
no					24 51%	
no response					13 26%	
3. A job placement program is in operation as part of the learning evaluation lab in my school.						
yes					43 91%	
no					1 2%	
no response					3 7%	
0. FOLLOW-UP SERVICES						
1. Procedures for follow-up services have been developed for the learning evaluation lab in my school.						
yes					36 77%	
no					5 10%	
no resporse					6 13%	
As a result of the Summer Workshop.						
yes					16 34%	
no					23 49%	
no response					8 17%	

TABLE 10 - NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE N=12		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY N=14		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA N=23		COMBINED RESPONSES N=49	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1. Objectives have been implemented in local school district curriculum.								
yes	11	92%	13	93%	23	100%	47	96%
no	1	8%	1	7%	0	0%	2	4%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2. Local information workshops for other personnel have been held.								
yes	11	92%	13	93%	23	100%	47	96%
no	1	8%	1	7%	0	0%	2	4%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3. Various publics within the school district have been informed about our career education program.								
yes	12	100%	13	93%	23	100%	47	96%
no	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	2	4%
4. These publics included:								
parent groups	9	20%	10	20%	18	18%	37	19%
school board	11	25%	14	26%	21	22%	46	24%
service organizations	5	11%	7	14%	19	19%	31	16%
local industries	12	28%	10	20%	18	18%	40	21%
job placement agencies	6	14%	10	20%	20	21%	36	19%
other	1	2%	0	0%	2	2%	3	1%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
5. Funds have been allocated for further development of career education programs.								
yes	12	100%	13	93%	21	96%	46	94%
no	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%
no response	0	0%	1	7%	1	2%	2	4%
6. Funds were allocated as follows:								
textbooks	8	17%	9	17%	19	15%	36	14%
equipment	6	13%	6	11%	17	13%	29	11%
workbooks	5	11%	7	12%	16	12%	28	11%
technical magazines	4	9%	3	[illegible]	10	8%	17	7%
business journals	3	6%	2	[illegible]	7	6%	12	5%
field trips	9	18%	11	22%	20	17%	40	16%
consultants	4	9%	3	6%	18	14%	25	10%
workshops	5	11%	8	16%	17	13%	30	12%
other	1	2%	2	4%	2	2%	5	2%
no response	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3	1%
7. There has been _____ public support for these career education programs.								
great	2	13%	5	29%	7	30%	14	26%
moderate	9	56%	8	57%	16	70%	33	61%
little	1	6%	2	14%	0	0%	3	6%
none	4	25%	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
8. Information about programs was disseminated by:								
superintendent's bulletin	0	0%	5	12%	7	10%	12	9%
newspaper articles	10	38%	13	32%	22	32%	45	33%
school newspaper	5	19%	9	22%	15	22%	29	21%
career days	7	27%	9	22%	10	14%	26	19%
teacher association bulletins	2	8%	2	5%	11	16%	15	11%
other	2	8%	3	7%	4	6%	9	7%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9. Student reaction to career education programs has been								
excellent	2	17%	6	43%	7	31%	15	31%
good	10	83%	6	43%	15	65%	31	63%
fair	0	0%	2	14%	1	4%	3	6%
poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
10. Programs and materials offered locally are relevant to the needs of students.								
yes	11	92%	14	100%	20	87%	45	92%
no	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
no response	1	8%	0	0%	2	9%	3	6%
11. Local factors tending to support career education programs within our district are:								
relevancy of learning	9	20%	10	21%	19	22%	38	21%
student-teacher involvement	10	22%	10	21%	22	25%	42	23%
variety of material	11	23%	10	21%	16	18%	37	20%
parent and public support	7	15%	8	17%	13	15%	28	15%
timeliness and usefulness of programs	9	20%	8	17%	17	19%	34	19%
other	0	0%	2	3%	1	1%	3	2%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
12. Local factors tending to inhibit programs were:								
lack of understanding	6	24%	8	22%	11	19%	25	21%
objectives were too broad	1	4%	2	6%	3	5%	6	5%
long & short range goals poorly defined	4	16%	4	11%	8	14%	16	13%
lack of intensive in-service training	3	12%	3	8%	15	10%	12	10%
need for greater financial support	4	16%	7	19%	15	25%	26	22%
need for better lines of communication	6	24%	10	28%	16	27%	32	26%
no response	1	4%	2	6%	0	0%	3	3%
13. Career awareness and career education programs have been developed to reflect the economic needs of the area served.								
yes	10	83%	13	93%	21	91%	44	90%
no	0	0%	1	7%	2	9%	3	6%
no response	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%
14. Area businesses and industry have been an integral part of local career education programs:								
great	2	17%	5	36%	8	35%	15	31%
moderate	7	58%	8	57%	9	39%	24	49%
little	2	17%	1	7%	6	26%	9	18%
none at all	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%
15. Responsibility for overseeing career education programs is assigned to:								
one full-time person	4	33%	6	43%	7	27%	17	33%
one part-time person	2	17%	4	29%	7	27%	13	25%
more than one person, part-time	3	25%	3	21%	11	42%	17	33%
no one	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
other	1	8%	1	7%	1	4%	3	6%
no response	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
16. Person in charge of career education programs is								
central office person	5	36%	7	41%	11	28%	23	33%
guidance counselor or director	0	0%	0	0%	4	10%	4	6%
occupational education specialist	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	1	1%
industrial arts teacher	1	7%	0	0%	2	5%	3	4%
home economics teacher	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
regular classroom teacher, elementary	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
vocational supervisor	5	36%	3	18%	6	15%	14	20%
Director of Vocational Education	0	0%	5	29%	7	18%	12	17%
other	2	14%	1	6%	7	18%	10	14%
no response	1	7%	0	0%	1	2%	2	3%
17. As career education programs develop, they are self sustaining.								
yes	3	25%	3	21%	1	4%	7	14%
no	7	58%	11	79%	22	96%	40	82%
no response	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%
18. An internal school district evaluation procedure for career education programs has been developed.								
yes	2	17%	5	36%	9	39%	16	33%
no	8	67%	9	64%	10	43%	27	55%
no response	2	16%	0	0%	4	18%	6	12%
19. Evaluation procedure was developed by:								
teachers involved	0	0%	5	25%	4	14%	9	15%
director of program	0	0%	5	25%	5	17%	10	16%
both	1	8%	3	15%	4	14%	8	13%
other	1	8%	1	5%	2	7%	4	7%
no response	10	84%	6	30%	14	48%	30	49%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
20. Based on the results of internal evaluation, local career education programs have been								
very successful	1	8%	3	15%	4	12%	8	14%
moderately successful	2	17%	4	20%	6	18%	12	22%
barely successful	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
not at all successful	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	9	75%	13	65%	23	67%	35	62%
21. Career education programs will be continued								
as presently written	2	17%	4	24%	5	21%	11	21%
with minor revision	6	50%	10	58%	17	71%	33	62%
with major revision	1	8%	2	12%	1	4%	4	8%
under other conditions	2	17%	1	6%	0	0%	3	6%
no response	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%	2	3%
22. Participants in the 1972 Career Education Summer Workshops were selected:								
from volunteers	6	29%	7	29%	6	16%	19	23%
by the principal	6	29%	8	33%	21	57%	35	43%
by other administrator	3	13%	6	25%	4	11%	13	16%
from those available	6	29%	3	13%	5	14%	14	17%
other	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
23. Participants in the Summer Workshops had some previous involvement in career education:								
all participants	0	0%	0	0%	3	17%	3	7%
no participants	5	36%	3	21%	4	22%	12	26%
some participants	8	57%	11	79%	9	50%	28	61%
no response	1	7%	0	0%	2	11%	3	6%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
24. Participant reactions to the Summer Workshops in Career Education were:								
very favorable	1	10%	0	0%	3	13%	4	8%
favorable	8	80%	11	73%	19	79%	38	78%
neutral	0	0%	3	20%	0	0%	3	6%
unfavorable	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
very unfavorable	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
do not know	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	2%
no response	1	10%	0	0%	1	4%	2	4%
25. Participants in the Summer Workshops tried new activities as a result of the Workshop experience.								
yes	12	100%	13	93%	22	96%	47	96%
no	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	2%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
26. These new activities included:								
developing instructional activities	11	13%	11	13%	19	12%	41	13%
developing career education units	10	12%	11	13%	20	13%	41	13%
conducting field trips oriented to c.e.	12	14%	11	13%	19	12%	42	13%
inviting speakers from industries & businesses	11	13%	13	15%	20	13%	44	13%
ordering c.e. related materials	12	14%	12	14%	20	13%	44	13%
conducting in-service programs related to c.e.	10	12%	7	8%	18	12%	35	10%
working as a team to implement c.e. programs	11	13%	11	12%	21	14%	43	13%
developing a job placement program	8	9%	10	11%	16	10%	34	10%
other	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%
no response	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

		GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
27.	In your opinion, the Career Education Summer Workshops were:								
	very effective	5	42%	4	29%	7	29%	16	32%
	somewhat effective	6	50%	10	71%	15	63%	31	62%
	neutral	1	8%	0	0%	1	4%	2	4%
	ineffective	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
	no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
28.	These workshops should be continued								
	with no modification	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	1	2%
	with some modification	11	92%	12	86%	21	92%	44	90%
	with much modification	1	8%	2	14%	1	4%	4	8%
	not at all	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
29.	Career education consultants from the University of College visited our district approximately ___ times during the school year.								
	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	1	0	0%	0	0%	4	16%	4	8%
	2	5	42%	2	15%	4	16%	11	22%
	3	0	0%	2	15%	4	16%	6	12%
	4	1	8%	4	32%	9	36%	14	28%
	5	2	17%	2	15%	2	8%	6	12%
	6	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%	2	4%
	more than 6	4	33%	3	23%	0	0%	7	14%
	no response	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

	GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE		GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY		UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA		COMBINED RESPONSES	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
30. The primary reason for each visit was to:								
follow-up on Summer Workshop activities	11	50%	10	40%	13	36%	34	41%
respond to specific requests for assistance . . .	3	14%	8	32%	12	33%	23	28%
generally review the use of summer workshop activities	8	36%	6	24%	8	22%	22	27%
do not know	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	1	1%
other	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%	2	2%
no response	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	1	1%

Section 4 - GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE

Component A: Fusing Self and Career Awareness into the Curriculum

Seven objectives were identified for this component: 1) the development of two career oriented activities, 2) assist in developing a guide for integrating career oriented activities to the established curriculum, 3) development of a plan for implementing the guide, 4) conduct team activities to assist other teachers, 5) construct and employ a plan for guidance activities, 6) facilitate career related information in the classroom, and 7) implement a workable delivery system in the school setting.

All participants agreed that career oriented activities were presented and developed during the summer workshop. Role playing, field trips, and resource persons were the most popular activities that participants used with students.

A comparison between participants and non-participants indicates statistically significant differences in the number of career oriented activities developed. For example: seventy-five percent of the participants developed 3 or more activities as compared to only forty-six of the non-participants. Differences were also noted in the suitability of the activities for grade level, in the degree of student intent, and in the quality of the activities as written. The most significant differences between the two groups was in the capability of the activities to meet the individual needs of the students.

Eighty-nine percent of the participants stated the purposes

of the interlocking guide were presented and developed. However, ten percent did not respond to this question which indicates the possibility that some confusion might have existed in their minds concerning the meaning and intent of the guides. Seventy percent agreed they had moderate to great input into the guide. This input, as well as agreement about the number of activities offered in the guide, showed significant differences between the two groups.

An important aspect in the development of the guide was its implementation. Eighty-five percent of the participants felt the interlocking guide which was developed did integrate career activities with the established curriculum when implemented. Most agreed that plans for implementing the guide were presented and developed at the Summer workshop. Significant differences were noted between the responses of the participants and non-participants concerning whether or not a plan had been developed for implementing the interlocking guide and how flexible it was in dealing with different areas of specialization.

Group guidance activities were presented and/or developed at the sumemr workshop according to 98% of the workshop participants. Activities most frequently noted by the respondents included interviews, field trips, guest speakers, and paper and pencil tests. Control group responses for this item on the questionnaire were quite similar with no more than a 7%

variation in any category. Workshop influence for this particular objective is questionable if not non-existent.

Seventy-seven percent of the workshop participants stated that systems for delivering career information to students was presented and/or developed during the Summer workshop. The chi-square analysis showed the relationship of the responses of the participant and non-participant groups to equal a probability at the .05 level.

The high percentage of positive responses to items in the participant questionnaire indicate that the summer workshop for this component met its objectives. However, it does not tell us how challenging the workshop was and whether or not it was compatible with the objectives of the participating school districts. An on-site debriefing conducted by Center staff at each school district would provide the answer to these and related concerns. Specific subjective determinations along these and similar lines are discussed in Section 6 of this report.

Based upon the Evaluation Team's analysis of the questionnaire data, and information gained through on-site interviews, it can be concluded that all workshop objectives for this component were met to a high degree with the exception of two which had a lower level of success. The exceptions include the facilitation of career related information in the classroom and the implementation of a workable delivery system.

Component B: Preparation of Local Guide for Disadvantaged and Handicapped

The workshop objectives identified for this component required participants to 1) identify the characteristics of the disadvantaged and handicapped, 2) select and apply adequate test instruments to identify disadvantaged and handicapped, 3) develop individualized learning activities

4) develop a listing of courses offered under the title of vocational, pre-vocational, and acemic subject areas in the school system, 5) define a list of nine terms, 6) participate in curriculum planning activities, and 7) contribute to a local interlocking guide.

All except two of the respondents agreed that procedures for identifying disadvantaged and handicapped students were presented and/or developed at the summer workshop. IQ tests, personality inventories and aptitude tests were the most frequently noted standardized tests utilized to distinguish disadvantaged and handicapped students. The non-participants also rated IQ and aptitude tests high and favored psychological tests more than aptitude tests. Fifty-five of the participant respondents indicated that instruments to assess disadvantaged and handicapped students were not developed in their school while the non-participant figure was 40%. Chi-square analysis did not indicate any probability relationships between these two groups for this objective measure.

Forty-one percent of the participants indicated they had not developed any individualized learning activities to meet the career orientation needs of handicapped students while only 18% responded the same for disadvantaged students. Several observations can be made relative to these percentages. The on-site visits conducted by the Evaluation Team tended to indicate that this may have been a too ambitious undertaking on the part of the Center. The basic concept of career education has to be accepted by superintendents, principals, and teachers prior to its acceptance for such specific groups as the disadvantaged and handicapped. However, the high percentage of respondents (60%) who had prepared one or more individualized learning activities for disadvantaged students indicates that this group is more

readily identified at the local level. THis is due, no doubt, to local efforts to secure Title I funds at the Federal level. The Evaluation Team could not find evidence during its on-site visits that comparable effort exists which would allow for the identification of handicapped students. Therefore, the potential success of the emphasis for this type of component appears to be far removed from the influence of the sponsoring Center.

Most participants (75%) agreed that individualized learning activities or units had been presented and discussed at the workshops. Sixty-eight percent indicated that they had been developed for academic subject areas related to the vocational interest of students. The impact of the workshop is not clear for this objective as the non-participant group indicated a 75% response. Similar percentage relationships exist between the participant and non-participant groups in the areas of developing interim objectives and revising the learning activities. Two possible explanations exist for this similarity of response between groups; the local school districts may already have been involved in these specific aspects of career education or else the non-participant sample interpreted the questionnaire items to mean all areas of academic endeavor and not just career education. On-site interviews did not indicate a specific reason for these particular responses to the questionnaire.

Sixty percent of the participants indicated that they had listed the vocational, prevocational, and academic subject areas

in their school system. However, the non-participant group had a 70% response to this same item. No significant correlation existed between the two groups for this objective.

All participant respondents indicated they had developed definitions for terms related to career education per workshop objective. Similar responses also existed in the non-participant questionnaires which were analyzed.

Seventy-five percent of the participants indicated that they had been actively involved in curriculum planning activities. ONly 45% of the control group responded in a positive manner to the questionnaire item for this objective.

The final objective called for the participants to contribute to a local interlocking guide. Analysis of the participant responses indicates that 54% took part in either writing philosophy, developing objectives, or developing guidelines for a guide. Another 15% participated in implementing a guide. Sixty percent of the non-participants also responded in a similar manner. The Evaluation Team believes that this similarity between the participant and non-participant groups is due to the fact that the participants were encouraged to involve those teachers in their respective schools who did not attend the workshop. Many of these teachers comprised the non-participant or control sample.

The Evaluation Team believes that all but one of the objectives for this component have been met, namely the disadvantaged and handicapped objective did not approach its success criteria.

Component C: Management by Objectives

Four objectives were identified in this component; 1) the production of written statements of the purposes of career education, 2) the development of evaluation techniques for observing classroom teaching situations, 3) the development of a management guide and, 4) the preparation of a plan for in-service training programs.

Eighty-seven percent of the participants stated that written statements of the purpose of career education were presented and developed at the summer workshop. All had some part in the actual writing of these statements and all expressed the belief that these statements reflect the relationship of career education to the total educational program of the district.

Less than half of the non-participants took part in the writing of the statements of purpose. Almost half (40% saw no relationship between career education and the district's educational program. On this question, a significant difference existed between those who attended the workshop sessions and those who did not attend.

The second objective dealt with the identification and development of evaluation techniques for observing classroom teaching situations. Forty percent of the participants said that procedures for developing observations were not discussed. Only 13% felt that they had great input into the development process and 20% could not state what specific procedures were

developed. Those who did develop these procedures included group seminar (brainstorming) and the selection of an existing observation form as the most popular procedures. At the conclusion of the summer workshops, it was determined that an attempt should be made to assess the procedures used during the school year 1972-73 to identify teacher competencies. The following were the major procedures identified by the majority of the participants: classroom observation, an interview with the teacher, and a test of student knowledge.

In general, the reaction of the participants to the quality and appropriateness of the management guide, identified as the third objective in the component, was favorable. However, 25% said that the guide was not available to school staff members, and 32% said it actually was not being used.

The fourth major objective of the component workshop was to structure in-service training programs for the components of the total project in each school district. There was generally strong agreement among the participants with respect to the presentation of the plans for in-service activity at the workshops and the implementation of them during the school year. As a check to this important point of implementation, it should be noted that none of the non-participants stated the in-service work was not done. Hence, there was agreement between the two groups that this objective was met satisfactorily.

In the participant group all of the members had some contact with consultants; half the number had as many as four or

or more contacts. One-third of the non-participants had no contacts.

All objectives for this workshop component appear to have been met with a relatively high degree of success. None of the objectives were successful above the 93% level.

Component D: Designing a Model Job Placement Center

There were four basic objectives in this component which included 1) the demonstration of an understanding of, the need for, and the rationale underlying the operation of a school system based Job Placement program, 2) the identification of different components making up a Job Placement program, 3) understanding of the mechanics required to introduce, organize, coordinate, evaluate and report on a total Job Placement program locally, and 4) the production of a plan of action to striucture the Job Placement program in the local school system.

All the participants agreed that possible rationales for the operation of a Job Placement program were presented and discussed during the summer workshop. All but one said the rationales were actually written. Their opinion of the comprehensiveness of the rationales was high insofar as they felt they covered all aspects of a job placement program. As many as 58% in this group stated in their opinion that the rationale covered all aspects of the program.

The second objective dealing with the component parts of the job placement program was fully presented and developed in the

summer workshop. There was close agreement between the two groups of respondents concerning the contributions of teachers, students, and administrators in the writing of descriptions of the various components.

Not all the components were developed in several schools. The majority of participants and non-participants felt that only some had been developed.

Approximately 75% of those who responded expressed positive opinions about the implementation of the components and the construction of plans to coordinate the activities of the various components.

It is evident that evaluation procedures were held in little regard by both groups of respondents in the development of a local job placement program. Less than one-third of the persons stated that all evaluation procedures were developed and implemented for the components of the program. Only 20% of the participants and 10% of the non-participants expressed the opinion that the evaluation results were successful.

A somewhat more favorable response was given to the reporting procedures developed, planned, and implemented.

Approximately 50% of the participants had up to at least four contacts with career education consultants; the remaining half had either five or six visits. The non-participant group had virtually no contact.

The purpose of the visits of the career education consultants was clear in the minds of the participants. They included the

following reasons for the consultants' visits: to follow-up on summer workshop practices, to respond to specific requests for assistance, and to generally review the use of workshop activities.

Only 60% of the respondents indicated they had produced a local plan of action for their job placement program while 27% did not respond. This was similar to the 67% response of the non-participants with 33% abstaining. Analysis of the Administrators Questionnaire (section 6) and on-site interview data indicate that definite reasons exist for this condition. Seventy percent of the administrators indicated they had received zero to little participation by local industry in job placement programs. Specific factors inhibiting such programs included "lack of understanding" (24%) and poor "lines of communication" (24%), according to superintendents responses. The conclusion must be made that while the workshop may have presented activities suitable for the development of a local job placement program, the prevailing conditions within the majority of the local school districts were not conducive to its implementation. This is a condition over which the institutional center has no control but must be taken into consideration in the development of future workshop offerings.

The Evaluation Team believes that the first three objectives for this workshop were accomplished and that the 4th objective was partially accomplished.

Component E - World of Construction

The eleven objectives for this workshop provided for participants to be able to do the following activities: a) Define the term career awareness, b) define the term "world of work", c) identify 50 construction industry occupations, d) identify 70 construction industry occupations to students, e) perform activities to demonstrate the 70 construction industry occupations, f) make known to students the minimum entry level educational requirements for construction industry occupations. g) assist students with hands on activities which will expose them to career concepts for this industry's occupations, h) plan and present hands on activities to students, i) make known to other educators in school system the activities used by students, j) order materials and equipment necessary to present the World of Construction, k) list three activities for math, science, and English that will bring about an interlocking of skills.

The small number of participants in this component (14) resulted in a correspondingly small number of respondents (7) upon which conclusions must be based as to whether or not the objectives were accomplished. The Evaluation Team makes the following determinations based upon its analysis of the specific item responses.

All objectives appear to have been accomplished. In several instances one respondent answered no to several of the

questionnaire items and one respondent did not respond in several other questionnaire items. While most of the responses were positive, there is no evidence that as many as 50 to 70 construction industry occupations were identified and demonstrated to students. The frequent no responses recorded for the small control sample tend to indicate that these teachers were not as familiar with the World of Construction curriculum requirements as were the workshop participants.

It should also be noted that the workshop participants said they had zero or one contact with career education consultants from the Center. Two participants indicated they had two and three contacts with consultants. This would indicate that consultants were able to visit some schools on a more frequent basis while other participants were not visited at all during the school year.

The Chi-square analysis indicated a probability of .05 in nine questionnaire response items and a probability of .01 in seven response items. This supports the Evaluation Team's contention that all objectives for this workshop were met even though the number of respondents for the participant group was only 50%.

Component G - World of Manufacturing

The objectives for this workshop required participants to demonstrate an understanding of the concepts of career awareness and the world of work, 2) demonstrate an ability to facilitate the students' understanding of himself, 3) implement a

world of manufacturing program, 4) select, organize, and initiate learning experiences for students, and 5) coordinate an interdisciplinary team effort with teachers.

The small number of participants in this workshop (11) resulted in a similar small number of questionnaire responses (5). There were only two instances where the Chi-Square analysis of items resulted in a significant statistic (items D7 and E1 in Table 8). Other item responses did tend to indicate that workshop objectives had been accomplished but the non-participant responses were also high in the same areas. The small number of respondents for both groups and the similarity of responses makes it virtually impossible for the Evaluation Team to make any vlaid statements on the degree of accomplishment for stated objectives.

Component H - Trade and Industrial Cluster

Five objectives were identified for this workshop component. They included 1) demonstration of an understanding of career awareness and the world of work, 2) demonstration of the ability to facilitate the students' understanding of himself, 3) development of a course of study on occupational orientation, 4) development of instructional plans to meed individual needs of students, and 4) selection, organization, and initiation of learning experiences for students.

The small number of participants in this workshop (19) resulted in a correspondingly small number of respondents (4).

However, there was little disagreement among respondents in all of the forced-choice categories. The assumption that all objectives had been accomplished could be made based upon the actual item responses. However, the small number of respondents does not necessarily allow the Evaluation Team to make a valid statement in regard to the degree of accomplishment of the stated objectives.

It should also be noted that the Evaluation Team did not receive any responses to the mailing of questionnaires to non-participants. The specialized nature of the target group for this workshop (trades and industries teachers and industrial arts specialists) made it difficult to identify a non-participant sample on the part of the local Contact Person. The Evaluation Team attained names for only three non-participants and none of these returned the questionnaire mailed to them.

Section 5 - GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Component A: Fusing Self and Career Awareness

The major objectives identified for participants in this workshop component include the following: 1) demonstrate an understanding of the concept of career awareness, 2) demonstrate an ability to facilitate the student's understanding of himself, 3) develop two career oriented activities, 4) assist in developing a guide to integrate career oriented activities into the established curriculum, 5) implement special guides developed for selected areas, 6) conduct team activities with other teachers; counselors will demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of their role 7) in a career education program through use of activities and 8) as a facilitator of career related information, and counselors will also 9) develop a workable delivery system.

Twelve questionnaire items subjected to the chi-square analysis proved to have a probability of .01 or .05 when compared to the non-participant response for the same item. One of these items, K-1 in Table 2, indicates an understanding of the concept of career awareness. Ninety-four percent of the respondants indicated the appropriate responses for this item. Several other items directly related to this objective also scored high and would tend to support the accomplishment of this objective, especially when one considers the difficulty in making an assessment of this particular objective.

Respondants indicated they felt that the degree of student

interest in their career oriented activities was average or better (62%). This may also indicate that students developed a better understanding of themselves although a direct measure of this objective by the Evaluation Team was virtually impossible. This may have been an overly ambitious undertaking on the part of the Center since any true measurement of success requires a direct contact with individual students with either tests or interviews.

Eighty-four percent of the participants developed two or more career oriented activities while sixty-four percent of the non-participant group also said they developed two or more activities. The chi-square analysis indicated a probability at the .01 level that the workshop caused a significant influence in the participant group for this objective.

Eighty-eight percent of the participant respondants said they had assisted in the development of an interlocking guide and eighty percent responded that the guide offered ten or more activities. Both of these item responses had a chi-square probability of .01 when compared to the non-participant responses.

Participants responded that sixty-nine percent had developed a plan flexible enough to deal with different areas of specialization. Chi-square analysis indicated a probability at the .01 level that participant responses for this item were influenced by the workshop.

Seventy-nine percent of the participants indicated that team activities to assist teachers in implementing career oriented activities were presented and/or developed at the Summer Workshop.

Responses to other items indicate the demonstration of a positive attitude toward the team activity concept.

The guidance counselors who responded to the questionnaire indicated that they had a knowledge and understanding of their role, that they had acted as a facilitator of career related information, and that a delivery system had been developed. The participant responses to these items were 97%, 62%, and 62% respectively. The low percentages for the last two objectives appear to be directly related to local constraints which were acknowledged in the administrators' questionnaires and during on-site interviews with superintendents. There were no superintendents or principals who indicated that the local career education program was the responsibility of the guidance counselor. Such responsibility was assigned to a central office person or to a vocational supervisor. The workshop objectives for counselors were accomplished up to the point where guidance counselors already had an existing operational system in their school. It would appear that district administrators were not willing to assign a new responsibility to guidance counselors until more definite commitments were forthcoming from outside the school district in the area of career education.

All objectives for this workshop component were accomplished with the exception of the second one for which the Evaluation Team did not have direct data upon which to base a valid judgment.

Component B: Interlocking Vocational and Academic Subjects

Objectives for this workshop required participants to 1) identify the nature and characteristics of disadvantaged and handicapped, 2) develop individualized learning activities, 3) assist in developing a local interlocking guide, and 4) conduct team planning activities.

The Evaluation Team did not assess whether or not the participants could identify the nature and characteristics of disadvantaged and handicapped students although it was determined that these areas were presented and/or discussed during the workshop.

Only fifty-six percent of the participants indicated that they had developed two or more individualized learning activities for disadvantaged students. Fifty-one percent of the non-participant sample also developed two or more individualized learning activities for the same group. The conclusion must be drawn that the workshop did not increase the local level of effort for the development of individualized activities for this specific group of students. The participant and non-participant responses for handicapped students were 29% and 44% respectively.

Only thirty-three percent of the participants helped prepare an interlocking guide. This objective was not completely accomplished based on the responses of the participant group.

Workshop participants thought that in-service team planning activities were valuable (75%) and that working as a team was more productive (81%). This is in direct proportion to the number of

respondants who indicated that procedures for team work were presented and/or developed during the workshop (82%). The objective for this component was accomplished.

Component C: Managing Career Education Programs

Five objectives were identified for this workshop component. They required the participant to 1) demonstrate an awareness of the concept of career awareness, 2) demonstrate the ability to recognize teacher competency for facilitating student understanding of himself, 3)develop a local management guide, 4) conduct in-service training, and 5) understand how to work with disadvantaged and handicapped students.

The Evaluation Team could not directly assess a participant's ability to demonstrate an understanding of the concept of career awareness. Nor was an assessment made of whether or not workshop participants could recognize teacher competency for facilitating student understanding of himself. Such an assessment requires direct contact with teachers and should include observation of their behavior. Such activity was not provided for in the Evaluation Team's overall plan. However, participants did indicate the types of procedures which were utilized (Table 3 - items B-1, B-4, and B-5) Eighty-two percent of the participants had some degree of input into the development of the observation procedures.

Only fifty-five percent of the participants indicated that a management guide was developed in their school/school district. Fifty-five percent indicated that the guide follows a sequential

order and fifty-five percent indicated that the guide defines realistic time lines to accomplish tasks.

Plans for in-service training were prepared in fifty-six percent of the participants' schools/school districts. However, fifty percent of the non-participant sample also responded positively to this questionnaire item. The low positive response to both this and the previous objective appear directly related to other questionnaire items. There was a fifty-six percent response when participants were asked whether or not a management model had been presented and/or developed at the workshop. This is consistent with participant responses already presented. There appears to be a large number of participants (estimated at 33%) who did not understand this aspect of the workshop material presented or who ended up being confused with some other aspect of the workshop.

It does not appear that these two objectives were accomplished to any high degree.

The Evaluation Team did not assess the participants' understandi of how to work with disadvantaged and handicapped students.

The Evaluation Team's judgment of the relative success of this component, based upon the data which was collected and analyzed, is that its overall achievement of objectives was not as high as in most other components.

Component D: Conducting Job Placement Service

Objectives for this component included the following: 1) demonstrate an understanding for the rationale of a school/system based

tion for a

job placement program, 2) demonstrate an understanding of the different components making up a complete job placement system, 3) demonstrate an understanding of the mechanics required to develop a total job placement program, 4) produce a workable model of a total job placement program, and 5) produce a plan of action for a job placement program.

Sixty-eight percent of the participants indicated that a rationale for the operation of a job placement program has been written, with 16% responding "no" and 16% "no response". The same 68% also felt that the rationale covers all aspects of the program. Unfortunately, only 16% indicated that the rationale had been either evaluated or validated. This lack of a local evaluation effort is further substantiated by the administrators' questionnaire which revealed that fifty-five percent of the responding school districts conducted no internal evaluation of their career education programs. The Evaluation Team believes that internal evaluation is a low priority item in most school districts. The item responses for this part of the questionnaire tend to support the conclusion that most workshop participants are probably able to meet the requirement for the first objective of this component. The Evaluation Team did not collect any additional data which would tend to support this conclusion.

All participants (100%) who responded to the questionnaire indicated that descriptions of the various components of a job placement program were presented and/or developed during the workshop. Only thirty-two percent indicated that they had developed

any descriptions and only eleven percent indicated that they had been developed by teachers. Item B-5 in Table 5 indicates that only sixteen percent of the target respondants said that the components of a job placement program had been developed for their school or district. This workshop objective did not attain its anticipated level of accomplishment. This lack of accomplishment is supported by the administrators' questionnaire and the on-site visits conducted by the Evaluation Team. Seventy percent of the superintendents indicated that they had received "zero" to "little" participation by local industry in job placement programs. Specific factors inhibiting these programs were identified as "Lack of understanding" (24%) and poor "lines of communication" (24%). The lack of accomplishment of this workshop objective appears to be the result of conditions at the local level and not necessarily due to the poor performance of workshop participants or the materials presented by Center staff..

Eighty-four percent of the participants indicated that the steps involved in implementing a job placement program had been identified, one hundred percent of the participants indicated that "some" of them had been implemented, and one hundred percent indicated that plans had been developed to coordinate the activities of the various components. There was a significant statistic ($p \leq .05$) for the chi-square analysis of these three questionnaire items. This workshop objective was accomplished to a high degree based on the responses of workshop participants.

The questionnaire did not directly assess the participants' ability to produce a workable model of a total job placement program. However, the generally high number of positive responses on related items could lead to the conclusion that most workshop participants would be able to produce the required model.

Review of questionnaire items relative to implementing and evaluating a job placement program indicated that viable action plans exist for 80-100% of the workshop participants. Reporting procedures have been developed by only 32% of the participating schools/districts, but there was also a high "no response" to this item (52%). While several implications can be drawn from this data, i.e., participants did not understand, were hesitant to respond negatively, or wanted to be supportive of the workshop, it must be remembered that the total number of respondants for this component was extremely small. The Evaluation Team would be remiss to draw firm conclusions from what it considers to be insufficient data.

Component E: Teaching Disadvantaged and Handicapped Students in Office Occupations

Objectives for this component required participants to 1) demonstrate an understanding of the concept of career awareness, 2) demonstrate the ability to facilitate the students understanding of himself, 3) implement an office grade nine program, 4) select, organize, and initiate learning experiences designed to broaden the student's self-perception, and 5) coordinate an interdisciplinary effort with a team of teachers.

Chi-square analysis of items N-4 and N-5 (Table 6) resulted in a significant statistic ($p<.05$) indicating that participant understanding of the concept of career awareness as determined by those items was directly influenced by the workshop. There were zero "no responses", which tends to reinforce this conclusion. The non-participant group responded with a high (51%) "no response" to these same items.

A direct measure of participants' ability to facilitate student understanding of himself was not made through the administration of the questionnaire. However, eighty-two percent of the participants indicated that student interest was average or better while fifty percent of the non-participants indicated a "no response". The Evaluation Team concludes that this objective was accomplished as measured by the questionnaire items.

The questionnaire did not ask any specific questions in regard to the development of a grade nine office program. However, a guide for career oriented activities was developed in only ten percent of the participants' schools, it offered less than ten units, it did integrate career activities with the established curriculum, a plan was developed for its implementation, and it was used during the 1972-73 school year. Closer examination of the data for this component in Table 6, however, indicates that the guide was developed by only one participant (due to the small number of participants in this workshop). Even with such a small number it is concluded that this objective was not accomplished since all but one of the participants returned their questionnaire.

Responses by participants to the questionnaire items would tend to indicate that those participants who developed career oriented activities (92%) also assisted in their selection, organization, and initiation

Ninety percent of the respondants indicated that in-service planning activities are a valuable experience; sixty percent indicated that procedures were presented and/or developed during the workshop; and one hundred percent agreed that working as a team is mor productive. It is concluded that workshop participants did coordinate an interdisciplinary effort with a team of teachers.

The objectives for this workshop component were accomplished to a very high degree.

Section 6 - UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Components A and B were combined and offered as one workshop. However, a revised workshop plan was not available so the Evaluation Team developed separate questionnaires for these components. These were mailed to the single listing of workshop participants. Separate non-participant questionnaires were mailed to separate groups for comparison purposes. The analysis was conducted separately for each component.

Component A

The objective s for this component required participants to 1) demonstrate, in an oral presentation, an understanding of the concept of career awareness and the world of work, 2) elaborate the strategy to be used in facilitating students understanding of self, 3) develop two career oriented activities, 4) prepare written assessments of the potential of the local program of instruction, 5) identify team activities to be employed in fusing career oriented activities and 6) contribute to the development of an overall guide. Objectives for counselors included 1) development of an outline of individual and group guidance activities, 2) identification of ways in which the counselor can directly support the classroom teachers need for career related information, and 3) development of a delivery system for making career related information available to students.

The Evaluation Team could not ascertain whether or not the

workshop participants were able to demonstrate their understanding of the concept of career awareness in an oral presentation. This particular activity was completed during the summer workshop.

The high correlation of questionnaire items on student interest and suitability of activities to student grade level (Table 2 - items A4 and A5) tend to indicate that satisfactory strategies were developed by participants to facilitate student understanding of self. There were no direct measures for this objective, however.

Eighty-eight percent of the participants indicated they had developed two or more career oriented activities. Only 32% of the non-participants said they had developed two or more activities. Twenty-five percent of the participants developed six or more activities.

The identification of team activities to be employed in fusing career oriented activities took place during the workshop and could not be directly evaluated. However 81% of the respondents indicated that the finished guide did integrate career activities with the established curriculum. Little direct data is available to indicate the degree of accomplishment of this workshop objective.

Eighty percent of the participant respondents said they had moderate to great input in the development of an interlocking guide. Only 50% of the participants said that a guide was developed during the school year. This discrepancy of approximately 30% may be due

to some participants developing all or part their guide during the workshop sessions.

Sixty-one percent of the counselor participants indicated that group guidance activities were presented and/or developed during the workshop. All participants designated one or more guidance activities which had been planned and implemented as a result of the workshop. This would also support the contention that during the workshop counselors had identified ways in which they could directly support classroom teachers. This objective could not be directly assessed.

Fifty-nine percent of the participants indicated that a plan had been developed for implementing the interlocking guide. Fifty-three percent of the participant respondents said that the plan had been used during the 1972-1973 school year. The delivery system for the implementation of the plan must have had significant impact at the local level because 60% of the non-participants also said that the plan had been used this year.

The Evaluation Team believes that all Component A objectives for this workshop were accomplished. However, the reader is cautioned that direct assessment of three objectives was not undertaken by the Evaluation Team.

Component B

The objectives required participants to 1) demonstrate to the program leadership team a perception of the nature and characteristics of disadvantaged and handicapped students, 2) develop at

least 12 individualized learning activities, 3) contribute to the development of a local guide, and 4) assist in identifying ways in which the interdisciplinary team can function in the local school.

Ninety-six percent of the participants stated that procedures for identifying handicapped and disadvantaged students were presented and developed. There was little disagreement that the following five methods were used to identify "in writing" handicapped and disadvantaged students: anecdotal records, check lists, case studies, interviews, and questionnaires. The first seemed to be the most popular.

Approximately one-fourth of the persons in each group stated they prepared no individualized learning activities to meet the career orientation needs of disadvantaged students. However, some 56% of the participants stated they prepared four or more activities. Sixty-two percent of the participants indicated they prepared no individualized learning activities for handicapped students.

Only 34% of the participants said they prepared four or more activities. Due to the large number of no responses in both groups to the question of implementation of individualized learning activities for both handicapped and disadvantaged students, it must be concluded that such implementation did not take place. In fact, the number of positive responses clearly indicating that implementation took place was under 50% for both groups.

Only 54% of the workshop participants assisted in the development of individualized learning activities. Participants also said that interim objectives had been included to assure successful

conclusion of the terminal objectives of the learning activities (51%). Data on the amount of direct participant involvement in the development of a guide is not avilable.

One hundred percent of the workshop participants said that procedures for teamwork were presented and/or developed during the summer workshop. Working as a team was deemed more productive by 90% of the participants. A high number of respondents (94%) said that a team was working within their school and 92% said that the team is relating aspects of the academic and vocational programs. This was a highly successful workshop objective.

Component C Management

The four objectives for this component required participants to 1) contribute to the development of a local management guide, 2) give written evidence that a knowledge of the concepts of career awareness has been acquired, 3) contribute to the development of a set of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of teaching strategies, and 4) contribute to the development of a plan for in-service training.

Ninety-one percent of the workshop participants said that a model for managing career and vocational education programs was presented and/or developed at the workshop. However, only 67% of the participants said that a management guide has been made available to school staff members. Sixty-two percent said they assisted in the development of the guide. Analysis of these questionnaire items indicated that this objective had little to

moderate degree of accomplishment.

Most participant respondents selected item choices (Table 4 - items G1, G2) which indicated a knowledge of the concepts of career awareness.

Only a few participants indicated they had any input in the development of observation procedures (42%). Only 71% of the respondents said that procedures for developing observations of classroom teaching situations were presented and/or developed. This objective may not have been fully explored during the workshop sessions.

Sixty-seven percent said that plans for in-service training programs have been prepared, 65% said that the plans provide for sufficient time to conduct in-service programs, 73% felt that the plans were designed to create an orderly presentation of program objectives, 73% said the plans have been implemented, and 67% said that the in-service appeared to meet the needs of the teachers. This objective appears to have been accomplished to only a moderate degree. On-site visits with the superintendents revealed that this is one type of activity which is difficult to undertake without considerable cooperation of all teachers and occasionally the need arises for extra funds in order to implement any extensive in-service training.

Component D - Job Placement

This workshop component required participants to 1) demonstrate an understanding of the need for a rationale for the operation of a

job placement program, 2) evaluate and identify existing placement activities, 3) utilize existing agencies for testing and placement, 4) understand and implement central coordination of job placement efforts, 5) demonstrate an understanding of work permits, child labor laws, and local school policies, and 6) demonstrate an understanding of establishing and maintaining employer-placement counselor relationships.

Ninety-three of the participant respondents said that possible rationale for the operation of job placement program had been presented and/or developed during the workshop. A similar high number (85%) of participants indicated that a rationale had been written and 66% said that it covered all aspects of their job placement program. Fifty-eight percent indicated that it had been evaluated or validated. However, 80% said that evaluation procedures have been developed for the job placement program, but only 73% said they had been implemented. Both of these objectives have been attained to a high degree.

Thirty-nine percent of the participants indicated that local agencies had been sought out for testing students and 83% said that local agencies had been sought out for placement. These placement efforts must have been highly effective because 73% of the participants said that the local agencies <u>are</u> providing job placement for students. Each of these three questionnaire items produced a significant statistic when subjected to Chi-Square analysis in comparison to the non-participant responses.

The high positive responses to the previous objective would also indicate that central coordination of job placement efforts also exists.

Ninety percent of the participants said they had identified federal and local laws which affect placement and 88% indicated they had considered these laws and regulations in developing their job placement program. The accomplishment of this objective is very high. Items for this objective produced a high probability statistic when subjected to Chi-Square analysis.

Workshop participants responded in the 91-95% range on the questionnaire items (Table 5 - G6, G7, G8) which dealt with employer-counselor relationships. Chi-Square analysis produced a significant statistic on all three of these items. This objective was accomplished to a very high degree.

All objectives for this workshop component were accomplished to a higher degree than almost any other component.

Component E Prevocational

The objectives of this component required participants to 1) demonstrate an understanding of career awareness, 2) demonstrate an ability to facilitate student's understanding of himself, 3) implement a mini-pre-vocational program, 4) select, organize, and initiate learning experiences, and 5) coordinate an interdisciplinary team effort.

Eighty-eight percent of the responding workshop participants said that concepts to develop career awareness were presented

and/or developed during the workshop. Eighty-one percent indicated that specific concepts have been identified or developed. This objective was accomplished based upon these questionnaire items. However, other items with high percentages of positive responses also support this contention.

Ninety-six percent of the participants indicated that activities designed to increase student understanding of self were presented and/or developed during the workshop. Eighty-nine percent said that such activities have been developed, 84% said they have been used by students, 81% said that student response to the activities was generally positive, and 87% said that some of the activities grew out of the activities and ideas presented at the workshop. All of these item responses indicate a high degree of accomplishment for this particular component objective.

A pre-vocational mini-course has been developed according to 81% of the participant respondents. Seventy-eight percent said the mini-courses have been used in the classroom, and 78% said that some of the mini-courses used were presented or developed at the summer workshop. However, 68% of these same respondents also said that the mini-courses need moderate to great revision. This should be a significant response for those individuals who are responsible for future teacher workshops at the institutional Center. This objective was accomplished to a high degree.

Eighty-eight percent of the participants have used learning

experiences with their students. Provisions have been made for revising the learning experiences (75%) and they need only little or moderate revision (90%). This component objective was also highly successful.

The formation of interdisciplinary teams only received a 46% positive response. While 94% of the respondents said that procedures for team work were presented and/or developed during the workshop, only 39% said that the team had developed procedures and guidelines. Thirty-four percent indicated that the team had provided assistance to other teachers. Little provision had been made to revise the work done by the team (35). Fifty-seven percent said that the procedures and activities developed by the team need moderate to great revision. The low level of accomplishment of this objective may be directly to local understanding of career education concepts and its relative priority in relationship to local goals and objectives.

Component G - World of Manufacturing

The ten objectives identified for this workshop component required each participant to 1) demonstrate orally or in a written report the concept of career awareness and the general relationship of local "World of Manufacturing" programs to the local career education model, 2) demonstrate orally the recent thrust of career education, 3) identify several sources of information concerning occupational requirements, 4) elaborate the strategies for placing manufacturing technology into the broader context of

industrial technology, 5) demonstrate in an oral presentation an understanding of the interrelationships between management, personnel, and production practices, 6) identify the vocations in manufacturing industries, 7) gain knowledge of selected student activities designed to promote student involvement, 8) design activities to develop responsible behavior and safe work attitudes in students, 9) select and organize learning experiences, and 10) set up a course outline for the school year.

The first three objectives listed above were not assessed by the Evaluation Team. They were short term process objectives which had to be evaluated during the workshop sessions.

Only 64% of the respondents said that procedures for relating manufacturing technology to industrial technology were presented and/or developed during the workshop. Sixty-eight percent said that procedures have been developed to make the relationships clear to students. The same percentage of respondents (68%) had moderate to great input into the development of these procedures and that they had been used in the classroom. Fifty-two percent said that the procedures needed little revision. This component objective had a moderate degree of success.

Objective five was demonstrated during the workshop but had significant relationship to the local implementation of the "World of Manufacturing" program. Eighty-four percent of the workshop participants who responded said that procedures for relating management, personnel, and production practices were presented and/or

discussed at the workshop. Only 68% identified the interrelationships and only 68% said that activities were provided within the instructional program to assist students in understanding the interrelationships. This objective for the workshop was only moderately successful.

The Evaluation Team could not assess whether or not workshop participants were able to identify the vocations in manufacturing industries (objective 6).

Sixty-eight percent of the workshop respondents indicated that activities have been developed to encourage student involvement, that student response to the activities was generally positive, that the activities resulted in greater student involvement, and that some of the activities grew out of ideas presented during the workshop. This objective had a moderate level of accomplishment and is directly related to objective seven relative to gaining a knowledge of selected student activities.

The Evaluation Team did not assess whether or not workshop participants designed activities to develop responsible behavior and safe work attitudes in students. This type of assessment would require direct contact with the students of workshop participants.

Many of the questionnaire item responses indicate that workshop participants did select and organize learning experiences. This is evidenced by the numbers of participants who developed activities for student involvement (68%).

Eighty-four percent of the respondents indicated that procedures for developing a course outline were presented and/or developed during the workshop. The same number of participants also said that a course outline or plan had been developed although only 68% indicated that it provides a clear picture of the levels through which students must move. Eighty-four percent said that the outline had been used in developing instructional plans. Only 52% said that the outline needed little revision, 32% thought it needed moderate to great revision. This objective was accomplished to a high degree.

SECTION VII

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE and INTERVIEWS

A major objective of this evaluation and program audit was to "Determine, if participants in training sessions have not exhibited improved or increased career education practices, reasons why such desired behavior on the part of the participants has not occurred."

Two procedures were used in the assessment of this objective.

As displayed in Table I, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to 97 selected administrators. Forty-nine questionnaires were forwarded directly to Superintendents of school districts which participated in the 1972 Career Education summer workshops. Forty-eight were directed to principals in participating school districts. This distribution of the administrators' questionnaires was limited to just one principal in each district. Twenty-nine (59%) of the target Superintendents responded. Twenty (42%) of the target principals responded. The tabulated answers of the returned questionnaires are displayed in Table number 10.

The second procedure employed by the Evaluation Team was the completion of a semi-structured on-site interview with either the Superintendent or his designee. Evaluation Team members interviewed 25 of the 27 Superintendents who expressed a willingness to participate in such an interview. Scheduling

difficulties made it impossible to actually interview the remaining administrators.

Administrators Questionnaire:

Ninety-six percent of the responding administrators agreed with the three following statements:

1. Objectives developed by teachers who participated in the Career Education Summer Workshops have been implemented in local district curriculum.
2. Local information workshops for other school district personnel have also been held.
3. Various publics within the school district have been informed about local career education programs.

It must be noted that given an opportunity to select all appropriate publics, 24% of the responses identified that school boards were informed more often in regard to local career education programs. None of the other identified publics were seen as being informed of career education programs by more than 21% of the administrators.

Ninety four percent indicated that funds have been allocated within the schools or school district for further development of of career education. The Evaluation Team suggests that the 6% who did not respond affirmatively may represent school districts were Summer Workshop objectives could not be attained because of the lack of local support for the total concept.

Several educators either wrote in separate letters or added comments to their questionnaires which offered some version of the following statement:

> "We were unable to implement the program developed at the Summer Workshop because funds were not made available by the local board."

Given an opportunity to select all applicable answers, not more than 40% of the administrators identified a single item (field trips) having received supporting funds.

Eighty-seven percent of the responses indicated either moderate or great public support for career education. The 12% of the administrators that indicated little or no public support may well be employed in districts where the lack of such support blocked the implementation of programs developed during career education Summer Workshops.

One hundred percent answered that procedures to disseminate information about career education exist.

More than 9% of all respondees felt that the programs and materials of career education programs were relevant and that students considered such programs to be either good or excellent.

Given the opportunity to identify factors that support or inhibit local career education programs, not more than 1/4 of the respondees agreed on specific factors. Student/teacher involvement was called out as supportive while the need for

better lines of communication was identified as inhibiting more effective program implementation.

Ninety percent of the responses indicated that the career awareness and career education programs which have been developed reflect the economic needs of the geographical area served.

The fact that 80% of all answers demonstrates that area businesses and industry have been an integral part of the local career education programs might be interpreted as commendable. The Evaluation Team believes that 100% of the responses should be affirmative if recommended guidelines for the development of job placement programs had been followed. It appears that the lack of an effective advisory committee contributes to the failure of a school district in its development of career education programs. Such programs should receive maximum impact from local business and industry.

Responsibility for the local programs is assigned in 1/3 of the districts to a full time person. The same members of districts assign the responsibility to more than one part time person while 25% of the districts have a single part time person responsible for the program. The need for better lines of communication has been identified as an inhibiting factor in the development of career education programs. The

comparatively large percentage (33%) of districts identify a divided responsibility for the program appears to re-enforce the need for clearly defined lines of communication and responsibility.

Only 33% of districts responding assign the responsibility for career education to a common job description. Sixty-seven percent scattered responsibility across seven other job titles. Several local educators interviewed by the Evaluation Team made comments that appear related to this item. First they indicated a need to more accurately define "career education". Considerable discomfort was disclosed by certain local educators with what they termed as either the unwillingness or the inability of state-wide "experts" to define career education. This lack of definition appears to have contributed toward confusion as to what skills are required of persons responsible for district-wide program development. Several persons who were interviewed displayed concern that career education might be too closely identified with vocational education and thus fail to gain broad support from teachers in all areas of the school programs.

Several teachers who received control questionnaires wrote to the Evaluation Team to point out that as academic teachers they had no interest in, or responsibility for, career education.

Eighty-two percent said "no" to the following questionnaire item: As career education programs develop, they are self sustaining, i.e. able to continue operation without specific financial aid from other than ordinary school district funds. Most of the central office personnel interviewed agreed that local funds should be used for career education but pointed out that the program is too new and unproven to realistically expect the local district to accept financial responsibility. A small number of those interviewed pointed out that their district already contributed substantial support to career education.

Some 55% of the administrators reported that no internal evaluation procedure had been developed to date. Local administrators spoke with considerable feeling about the entire concept of program evaluation. Evaluation Team members were able to identify five separate and distinct evaluation efforts going on within most participating school districts relative to the institutional Center programs.
Many local administrators believed the overall evaluation requirements to be excessive, sometimes ill conceived and most always poorly or improperly interpreted.

Questions 19 and 20 indicate that the development of internal evaluation procedures was a matter of low priority with the local school districts. Forty-nine percent of the

replies to item 19 and sixty-two percent to item 20 offered no response.

Eighty-three percent of the replies indicate that the career education program will be continued either as presently written or with only minor revisions. Eight percent indicated that major revisions would be made to insure the contention of the program.

Local administrators emphasized on several occasions the importance of making appropriate revisions in each program whenever the program is to be used with a different group of students. The need for this type of revision was also cited by more than 25 persons returning target questionnaires from the workshop component mailing.

Forty-three percent of the respondents indicated that the principal selected the participants for the Summer Workshops. Twenty-three percent reported that participants were selected from volunteers. About 1/4 of the administrators interviewed by the Evaluation Team specifically commented upon the selection process. The first comment indicated a belief that inadequate notice was given for the Workshop. Increased lead time would have allowed a more effective participant selection process at the local level. Concern was expressed about the entry level skills of workshop participants. Both administrators and educators

returning target questionnaires for components indicated that some workshop participants had already mastered the knowledge and skills which were presented at the workshop. Additionally, a somewhat smaller number of administrators and target questionnaire respondents indicated concern that the workshop trainers assumed that workshop participants had mastered skills and knowledge which, in fact, were beyond them.

Eighty-six percent of the respondents stated that participants in their district reacted either very favorably or favorably to the workshop. There is a possibility that at least some of the remaining persons who were either neutral or unfavorable toward the workshop were persons who already had highly developed skills in the areas presented.

Ninety-six percent of the administrators said that workshop participants tried new activities as a result of the workshop experience. Some 3% of the individuals who returned the workshop target questionnaires appended a note indicating that they did not try new activities as a result of the workshop because the activities discussed at the workshop were already an integral part of their program prior to workshop participation.

Responding administrators felt that the same eight different new activities were tried in their district in about

an equal ratio.

Although 32% of the administrators considered t he workshop to be very effective, 62% considered them to be only somewhat effective. When compared with the fact that 40% of the administrators thought that the program should be continued with some modification, the indication is there is local concern at a fairly high level relative to workshop offerings.

The figures displayed for questionnaire items 29 and 30 indicate that university or college consultants did visit most school districts to follow up on Summer Workshop activities. A wide range in the number of visits was indicated and it appears that some of the geographically distant districts received fewer visits. Several administrators in southern Georgia also expressed concern about the great distance between the training center and their district.

Administrators' Interview:

Evaluation Team members visited twenty-five school districts ranging geographically from Ringgold in the northeast corner of the state to Blakley in the southwestern part of the state. Team members traveled more than 3500 miles as they visited with school district personnel throughout the state. The districts visited had all participated

in the summer training programs presented by each of the three institutional Centers.

Each interview initially focused upon thirteen questions directly related to their responses on the questionnaire. Additionally, each local administrator was encouraged to comment upon any aspect of his career education program which might not have been touched upon in sufficient detail in the questionnaire.

All except one administrator felt career education was important for students in grades 1-12. This one exception felt that career education was important in post-secondary years as well.

Although all of the administrators rated the training received at the workshops as satisfactory, at least half of them added some parathetical comment. Concern about matching workshop content to the entry skills of the participants was most frequently mentioned. Examples of training being too basic for workshop participants were frequently cited.

Every administrator felt that there were teachers within the school district that needed additional training in any of the several areas. Most administrators felt that academic teachers needed inservice training to understand the importance of career education. A small number of respondents felt that some vocational teachers needed in-service train-

ing to develop a broader understanding of the basic concept. Almost without exception, the administrators identified additional in-service training as one of the key activities needed in order to insure future programs.

Most administrators indicated that the funds available to support career education came from federal, state and local sources. Two administrators indicated that local funds were not involved. The Evaluation Team was led to believe that participating school districts obligated themselves to provide some specified level of financial support at the local level in order to participate in the Summer Workshop programs.

Many people not associated with local schools have been aligned with career education programs at the local level. Business and industry representatives have been quick to supply resource people for specific groups of students within the local schools. One firm has a program in which teachers are hired and provided an opportunity to become fully acquainted with the manufacturing operations. Most school districts were enthusiastic about the Governors Conference on Career Education and reported participation for lay people as well as professional staffs.

One question posed to Superintendents was, "Please identify the major accomplishments of career education:."

Respondents were about equally divided in stating "helping children learn the dignity of work", "causing teachers to recognize the need to create a relevant curriculum", and "provide students with a purpose for attending school".

When asked to identify an existing problem in the development of career education every administrator answered "money". Year-to-year funding without any indication of availability of continuation of funding for a specific program was identified as a major stumbling block in the long range development of career education programs.

The information made available to the Evaluation Team from the administrators' questionnaires and the on-site interviews basically supported the findings of the other procedures utilized during the evaluation and program audit. Many administrators provided some insight into the overall program and their comments are worthy of note.

Comment #1
"The program offered by our Center changed because one trainor left after only a single session and Dr. - - - - - did everything possible to provide the anticipated training. The questionnaire received from the Evaluation Team went into workshop detail to a greater degree than the contents of the actual workshop program." (As noted earlier, the target questionnaires were developed directly from workshop objectives as discussed with Center personnel.)

Comment #2
"The late announcement of the workshops made it very difficult to recruit appropriate staff members for participation and when the date and location of

the workshop was later changed, it then became virtually impossible to get participants who could attend."

Comment #3
"The consultants were sincere and knowledgeable about specific areas of career education. Unfortunately, they did not know:

- how decisions are reached at the local district level
- the entry skill level of workshop participants
- the problems of individual districts, or where our district was located."

Section 8 - SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Evaluation Team's summary of the degree to which the three institutional Centers accomplished their workshop component objectives is displayed separately for each Center on Tables 11 through 13 at the end of this section. The reader should keep in mind that while initial examination of these tables may indicate a higher degree of accomplishment of objectives at one institution, there were many local school district influences upon participant behavior which could not be controlled by Center staff. Hence, in those instances where objectives were not accomplished, as indicated by evaluation findings, an examination must also be made of the local constraints which inhibited the organization and implementation of workshop models, concepts, and ideas.

There are definite recommendations which the Evaluation Team must make relative to its finding for the 1972-73 school year and the implications for planning for the 1973-74 school year. The specific recommendations are as follows:

1. Increased lead time needs to be provided when local school districts are to be notified that they are eligible for participation in summer workshops. This will allow time to select participants with qualifications and entry skills for which the workshop is designed. (At least one superintendent commented during the interview that there has been even less lead time this year in his district when compared to last year.)

2. Subject matter content of future summer workshop programs should be more closely related to the entry skills of participants and the local school district requirements for more skilled career and vocational education staff.

3. Improved participant selection processes need to be developed and displayed to local school districts participating in summer workshops, i.e., a French teacher should not be involved in a summer workshop on "World of Construction" curriculum development just because (s)he was the only professional staff member who had not yet made another commitment for the summer.

4. Workshop objectives should be compared to local school district objects for the same topic. On-site interviews indicated that priorities for objectives were not similar and that a particular workshop was bound to fail.

5. Changes in location and dates of summer workshops should not be made just prior to the originally scheduled time. Schedulers of summer activities for professionals should be sensitive to the fact that such changes on a short notice will eliminate many of the desired participants.

6. There should be a reduction in the number of evaluations to which summer workshop participants must submit; particularly when the participants want to learn more but not have to face three different evaluation groups as a result of being involved.

7. Future evaluation planning should consider placing more emphasis on processes rather than products. (Even though a workshop participant may be given a model for a job placement program he cannot implement it in his school district if (s)he does not understand the processes involved.)

8. Procedures should be developed which would allow workshop consultants to better familiarize themselves with local school district management processes, constraints placed upon local professional staff, and the degree of local commitment to the workshop/technical assistance subject matter area.

9. Consideration should be given to multi-year funding of local programs in order to allow school districts to plan more effectively and develop a more positive attitude toward career education programs.

10. Consideration should be given to locating an institutional Center in closer proximity to school districts located in the southern part of the state.

11. Serious consideration should be given by State and local education agencies to the idea of not accepting grant funds when they are made available late in the school year, do not provide for a reasonably comprehensive program, or cannot otherwise be effectively utilized due to local constraints.

TABLE 11. SUMMARY OF DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF SEPERATE WORKSHOP COMPONENT OBJECTIVES FOR GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE.

	COMPONENTS							
OBJECTIVE NO.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	+	+	+	+	+		*	*
2	+	-	+	+	+		*	*
3	+	+	+	+	+		*	*
4	+	+	+	±	+		*	*
5	+	+			+			
6	±	+			+			
7	±	+			+			
8					+	DROPPED		
9					+			
10					+			
11					+			

* = Unable to make valid conclusion (size of respondent group too small)

Degree of accomplishment:
+ = Objective accomplished above 80% level
± = Objective accomplished between 50-79% level
- = Objective not accomplished, below 50% level

TABLE 12 SUMMARY OF DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF SEPARATE WORKSHOP COMPONENT OBJECTIVES FOR GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

	COMPONENTS							
OBJECTIVE NO.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	+	*	*	+	+			
2	±	-	*	-	+			
3	+	-	±	+	-			
4	+	+	±	*	*	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	±		*	*	+			
6	+							
7	+							
8	-							
9	-							

* = Unable to make valid conclusion (sufficient data not available to Evaluation Team)

Degree of accomplishment:
+ = Objective accomplished above 80% level
± = Objective accomplished between 50-79% level
- = Objective not accomplished, below 50% level

TABLE 13 SUMMARY OF DEGREE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT OF SEPARATE WORKSHOP COMPONENT OBJECTIVES FOR UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

	COMPONENTS						
OBJECTIVE NO.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	*	+	+-	+	+		*
2	+	-	+	+	+		*
3	+	*	-	+	+		*
4	+	+	+-	+	+		+-
5	*			+	-		+-
6	*			+			+-
7	+						+-
8	+						*
9	+						+-
10							+

* = Unable to make valid conclusion (sufficient data not available to Evaluation Team)

Degree of accomplishment:
+ = Objective accomplished above 80% level
+- = Objective accomplished between 50-79% level
- = Objective not accomplished, below 50% level